THE
Reverend and Learned
DR. *HAMMOND*,
AND HIS
Paraphrase and Annotations
On the
NEW TESTAMENT,
VINDICATED
FROM

The Rude and Unjust *Reflections* made upon Him and Them by *Monsieur Le* CLERC, in his *Supplement* to Dr. *Hammond's Paraphrase*, &c.

With some brief Animadversions on his LETTER prefix'd to his *Supplement*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Luke Meredith*, at the *Star* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*, MDCXCIX.

Wing R-1192 (vi), 84, (vi) pp
4/yt- inclus index ✓ cp
H509 off

TO

My Learned and Pious Friend,

T. B. Doctor of Divinity.

SIR,

THE last time I enjoy'd the freedom and happiness of your Conversation, you may remember we fell into discourse about Monsieur Le Clerc's Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament. *I observed, that you were most of all displeased with his Performance, for these Two Reasons: First, Because he had dealt so roughly with a Person to whose Memory you pay so great a Respect and Veneration: And, Secondly, Because he hath taken all occasions to misinterpret and wrest those places of Scripture which assert or confirm the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, and more-especially of our Saviour's Divinity. This short Account which you then gave of this* French *Writer, I have since found, upon a deliberate perusal of him, to be exactly adjusted to Truth. And*

the grounds of your Diſguſt have been ſo here prevalent with me, that they produced what I offer to you. I have been herein very plain and free in laying open the Author; and I ſhall continue to be ſuch, if there be farther occaſion for it afterwards: For I ſhall always retain that Perſuaſion which I told you I was of, at our laſt meeting, namely, that this is not a time for Dawbing. *We ought to be open and clear-ſpirited, and fully reſolv'd not to betray the Truth. We may perhaps offend ſome nice ears, and exaſperate thoſe whom we oppoſe; but that is none of our fault, but theirs. For none ſhould be offended at Truth: And he that is exaſperated by it, diſcovers an ulcerated Mind.*

I know ſome Authors are remark'd, and generally voted to have a plentiful daſh of Satyr *in their Writings, and they are thought to carry Daggers in their Pen-caſes, as Dr.* Par. *Mr.* Mar. *Dr.* S——h; *Mr.* E. *when a Well-willer to* Socinus *or to the* Deiſts *comes in his way; Mr.* B. *when a* Rival-Critick *falls into his hands; and Mr.* T. *when the* Church-men *eſpecially, or a* Standing-Army *(which are alike to him) come under his Pounces. It may be, ſome Readers will be ready to adopt me into the number of theſe Gentlemen, becauſe of my preſent Freedom and Boldneſs: But then I have this to ſay to them, That I am but a Beginner, and I do*

not

not intend to make a conſtant practice of this way of writing. Though truly, at preſent, I think there is ſome neceſſity for it, and I am in hopes that it will do ſome Good. There is a Foreign *Writer, we ſee, that comes on fiercely of late, and Charges with great fury: ſo that we muſt be ſomewhat brisk in our Rebukes, or elſe he will grow upon us, and get ground. We ſee he flies at all, and confidently impoſes his extravagant Whimſies on the World, whereof there is one delicate Inſtance in his* Supplement, *on* Luk. xiv. 34. *where, by* Salt, *he would needs perſuade us is meant* Wood-aſhes. *It is pity that a Man of ſome Parts, but greater Induſtry and Moiling, ſhould thus trifle and play the fool, whilſt he ventures at all things. One may ſay of him, as was rightly ſaid of old concerning ſome others of the like daring humour,* Οὐκ αἰσχρὸν τὸ μὴ πάντα δύνασθαι· τὸ δὲ, μὴ δυναμένους ἢ μὴ πεφυκότας, ἀναδέχεσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα, [*Plat.* περὶ δυσωπίας.] "It is not "baſe and ſhameful, that he cannot do all "things; but to undertake to do what he "can't do, and was never made for, that is "baſe." *It may be this Plain-dealing will make him a Convert: And I moſt heartily beg of the Divine Goodneſs that it may be in ſome degree ſerviceable to this end, for which I deſign'd it. And then,* Sir, *I ſhall not think*

I have loſt my Time (which you know I can ill ſpare, in my preſent Circumſtances) in ſpending ſome of it, in improving thoſe Hints which I had from you, concerning this Writer and his Supplement. I am,

SIR,

With the utmoſt Sincerity,

Your moſt Affectionate,

and Humble Servant.

A VIN-

A

VINDICATION

OF

Dr. *HAMMOND*,

From the Unjuſt *Reflections* of

Monſieur Le CLERC.

WE ſee here, in a plain Example before our eyes, that it is not Vertue and Goodneſs, it is not Worth and Excellency, it is not Learning and Renown, it is not the Sacredneſs of a Man's Character, nor his Eminency in the Church, that can skreen him from the virulent Tongues, and rude Inſults of thoſe that have taken up a Reſolution to calumniate, defame and injure others. And this we ſee done by a *Foreigner*, who ſhould have been modeſt and reſerv'd, and not have intermedled with ano-

ther Church and Nation, eſpecially ſo far as to expoſe One who was the Glory of them. And that this is done by a *Refugé*, who hath been nouriſh'd by the Hoſpitable *Dutch*, and by ſome Generous *Engliſh* who ſojourn in thoſe Parts, that ſuch a one ſhould ſo ſoon wax fat, and kick againſt one of the moſt Eminent Divines of the Church of *England*, is a great Aggravation of the Fact. And how this can be reconciled with what he ſaith within four Pages of his Book, (*viz.*) That *no Man hath a greater value for the* Engliſh *Clergy than he*, let the World judge. Truly, we can expect nothing of Integrity, nothing that is fair, from ſuch a Man; one that is a Fugitive from his Word and Profeſſion, as well as from his Country. And now having this notice of him, we may ſurceaſe our wonder at what he hath done: it can't ſurprize us, that he hath dealt ſo rudely and unchriſtianly with one of the Braveſt Men of his time. So it was nothing could hinder him from his vile Attempt, for it is in his nature to act thus.

1. He repreſents the Doctor as a Man of mean Parts, and groveling Abilities. *His Memory fails him*, ſaith he, *p.* 76. and he very often objects to him a great and ſhameful defect in this faculty. Nor are his Intellectuals leſs deficient, though, poor man, he is very induſtrious and laborious, and would underſtand ſomething, if he could. *The Doctor takes abun-*

abundance of pains to interpret a place, to little purpoſe, p. 121. He had better let this Interpreting Trade alone, for he wants a νῦς for it: *His Conceptions themſelves are dark and perplexed*, p. 645. and how is it poſſible then he ſhould enlighten a Text? It is true, *he hath his little Subtilties*, p. 393. *The Doctor takes more pains, and uſes greater ſubtilty than he needed to have done*, p. 51. But he wants Judgment, he hath no ability to exerciſe any clear Reaſon about a Point, to ſpeak truth, or to utter any thing conſiſtently: *He is hard put to it, to extricate himſelf out of the maze of his perplexed Reaſoning*, p. 295. But, poor blind Creature, he goes on, and *heaps miſtakes upon miſtakes*, p. 259. *He covers one miſtake with another, to keep them, as one ſaid, from leaking*, p. 276. It is no wonder therefore that *the Doctor contradicts himſelf*, p. 80. and that *his arguing is abſurd*, p. 217. and that *what he dreams, like other dreams, hath no truth in it*, p. 331. It muſt needs be ſo, and can't be help'd, becauſe the Doctor is ſo mean and low in his Intellectuals.

2. *Monſieur Le Clerc* repreſents him as one not only defective in Natural Parts, but in Acquired Learning. Alas! what can we expect from a Man that had no foundation? one that had not been a *Grammarian* and *Critick* from his Cradle? one that had not learn'd

Anti-

Antiquities from his Old Nurſe? It is impoſſible the Doctor ſhould be a good *Paraphraſt* or *Annotator*, when *he doth not give any evidence of his great Skill in Grammar*, p. 46. Nay, not to mince it, *he is an indifferent Grammarian*, p. 313. If you obſerve it, *he finds difficulties in the plaineſt things; and the reaſon is, becauſe he had not from his youth made it his buſineſs carefully to ſtudy Criticks*, p. 33. Thence it is, that *he ſhews himſelf a very unfortunate Critick*, p. 332. Particularly in many places he faulters, *for want of skill in Roman Antiquities*, p. 291. and elſewhere. When the Learned Doctor, on 1 *Theſ.* v. 3. had upon an excellent Subject there uſed a great deal of uſeful Criticiſm, *Monſieur* thus ſupercilioufly ſpeaks, like one that had been a Critick from a Boy, and that had been an Antiquary without a Beard, (for elſe, you know, he could not be *Fortunate*) *For all that he hath here heaped together, I would not give one ruſh*, p. 489. This is the true and genuine Dialect of a Right Haughty Critick, *i.e.* one who deſpiſes the Critical Skill, and other kind of Learning, of all Men but himſelf.

3. *Monſieur* proceeds, and condemns the Doctor's *Stile* and *Phraſe*, and will by no means allow him to ſpeak intelligibly or properly. *Perſpicuity was not his Talent*, p. 37. *He did not care how he expreſs'd himſelf, provided the Reader*

Reader could but gueſs his meaning, p. 90. *He expreſs'd himſelf very awkardly*, p. 645. *The Doctor's way of expreſſion is harſh and forced*, p. 20. The *Monſieur* riſes yet higher, *p.* 197. *Intolerable Impropriety of Speech, is a thing that the Doctor never ſcrupled:* And higher yet, *p.* 145. where he mentions thoſe that *are not aſhamed, when they ſpeak never ſo clowniſhly or improperly*, and adds, *of which number certainly the Doctor was.* And afterwards, he declares, that *the Doctor having no regard to Propriety of Speech in his own Stile, is as careleſs of it in interpreting another's*, p. 272. But he comes to the heighth of all, when he averrs, that the Doctor *ſpeaks barbarouſly*, as well as *improperly*, p. 357. and that *in his Annotations on the* General Epiſtles of St. Peter, *he hath ſurpaſs'd himſelf in Barbarouſneſs of Stile*, p. 589. And who then can approve of ſuch a *Barbarian* for an Interpreter of Scripture?

4. Our *Monſieur* ventures at all, and boldly Criticizes on the Doctor's Morals, as well as his Intellectuals and other Properties. He every where expoſes him as one that makes no conſcience of impoſing upon his Readers, and abuſing the Sacred Text. According to him, the Doctor, ſometimes, merely to eke out his Annotations, ſaith any thing, though it be never ſo ſilly and untrue: *He ſets down things, only to fill up his Annotations, which he finds would other-*

otherwiſe be but ſhort, p. 288. So again, *p.* 635. *Theſe falſe and vain Subtilties he collected on this Chapter, that he might not ſeem to be ſhort.* And *p.* 141. *Sometimes, that he may not be wholly ſilent, he is forc'd to ſay a great many far-fetch'd things.* Nay, he ſets his Invention on work, to feign any thing that he hath a mind to put into his Notes on the Bible: *He often adds to the Sacred Writers what he pleaſes*, p. 538. *He often forges an Interpretation, by heaping together a parcel of very ſlight Conjectures*, p. 593. *That is another of Dr.* Hammond's *Fictions*, p. 336. *What is here ſaid of the Church of* Rome, *was, I believe, invented by Dr.* Hammond, *to reconcile*, &c. p. 647. As much as to ſay, the Doctor feign'd Matter of Fact, to ſerve his own ends. And as for perverting of Scripture, *Monſieur* repreſents the Doctor as very dexterous at that: *He wreſts a great many things in favour of his own ſide*, p. 442. And at ſeveral other times he charges him with *wreſting of places of Scripture.* He makes him a great Plagiary, and a fooliſh one too; for he tells us, that the Doctor *takes things out of Authors with very little care*, p. 50. *He alledges paſſages out of them but by halves, and tranſlates them abſurdly*, p. 387. And beſides all this wilful Careleſneſs and Unfaithfulneſs, the Doctor is tax'd with Vain-glory and Oſtentation: He ſaith many things in his Interpretations, *perhaps to have the reputation of ſaying*

ing ſomething new, p. 276. as if he would betray the Truth, and aſſert and write any thing, to get a Name, by being the Inventor of a Notion or Opinion: which is to make him the moſt Profligate Wretch that ever wagg'd a Tongue, or handled a Pen.

This is the Idea which *Monſieur Le Clerc* gives us of Dr. *Hammond*, and I have faithfully ſet it down in his own individual words. In ſome places, it is true, he ſeems to ſpeak reſpectfully of him, and to value him; but he only flatters him, that he may treat him the more roughly, and ſpeak the more contumelioufly of him afterwards, and that his Spite againſt him may not be ſuſpected. There is much more of the ſame kind, that I have noted in this *Supplement*; but I thought this would be ſufficient to give the Reader a Specimen of our *Frenchman*'s Genius and Deſign, in his late Undertaking againſt that Excellent Perſon. All along he delights in being captious and ſnappiſh: He makes it his work to ſpeak contemptibly of the Doctor, to blaſt his Credit, and to ſhew himſelf a thorough-paced Railer. But there is no foundation for all this; which is the next thing I will undertake. And to prove this, I will ſhew, that all that the *Monſieur* hath ſaid, is eaſily confuted: 1. From the general Eſteem of the Doctor and his Work. 2. From the *Monſieur*'s Tranſlating of it. 3. From the Vanity of his Exceptions againſt

againſt the Doctor and his Book, and (to join them together) from the Vanity of his own Interpretations.

Firſt, The general Eſteem and Repute which Dr. *Hammond* had purchas'd, is a Confutation of the *Monſieur*'s ſcurrilous Raillery. All that had the happineſs of a Perſonal Acquaintance with the Doctor, were aſtoniſh'd at his great Parts and Reach; they, with admiration, had experience of the depth of his Judgment, which is ſooneſt diſcern'd and try'd in Controverſial Points, and ſuch as require profound Skill to remove the Difficulty of them. So that he who repreſents him as a Weak Man, is to be voted ſo himſelf, and ſomething more. Beſides his Natural Abilities, he was Maſter of all ſorts of Learning, by an indefatigable Study, by conſtant Reading, by deep Thoughtfulneſs, and by a daily converſe with the Learned. It is true, he had his Particular and Beloved Notions, and ſo have moſt of the Eminenteſt Writers that can be named; and no Wiſe and Intelligent Perſon derogates from them on that account, but rather interprets ſuch ſingular Strains to be the reſult of a more than uſual Searching into things, though perhaps he doth not agree with them in the Applying of them.

As for *Stile*, every one is Maſter of a particular one, and we cannot ſay, this Writer's Stile is not like ſuch a one's, therefore it is ill; for there

there are peculiar Graces belonging to different Modes and Shapes of Speech. But this is certain, that our Learned Doctor's Language in his *Paraphraſe* and *Annotations*, though ſometimes it be exuberant and ſwelling, and ſometimes ſeems to be diſturb'd by *Parentheſes*, yet it is always Manly and Nervous, it is ever ſignificant and full, and generally his Parentheſes contain more in them, than the ſmoother and uninterrupted Lines of moſt other Writers. It is a wonder that any Man, pretending to judge of Language and Expreſſion, ſhould have the face to ſay the contrary in publick. There is no Author but hath his failings of one kind or other, eſpecially in Words and Phraſe: This is common to Humane Nature; and to reproach one here, is an affront to Mankind. Eſpecially *Monſieur Le Clerc* ſhould have gently touch'd on this, if it were only to favour himſelf.

Then, for the Doctor's *Piety*, none of our *Engliſh* Clergy were more eminent for this, as Dr. *Fell*'s *Account of his Life* may convince any Man. Nay, thoſe that had no good opinion of Dr. *Hammond*'s Perſuaſion in ſome things, yet admir'd and own'd his Exemplary Vertue, and reverenc'd him for the Sedate Temper of his Mind, for that Integrity and Faithfulneſs, that Humility and Condeſcenſion, that extenſive Love and Charity, and that extraordinary Strictneſs of Life which they beheld in him.

Where-

Wherefore, I am confident, there is not one Man of ſober thoughts, that will give the leaſt credit to the *Monſieur*, when he attempts to perſuade his Readers that this worthy Man uſed ill Arts in Expounding the Bible, and ſacrificed the Sacred Truths of it to his own Humour and Prejudice, to Affectation and Vain-glory.

And as for this particular Work which the Author of the *Supplement* ſo zealouſly ſtrives to diſparage, there could not have been a greater proof of his folly and raſhneſs than this; for the Doctor's Performance on the *New Teſtament*, hath gain'd him the Applauſe of the moſt Learned in the three Kingdoms. All Lovers of Divine and Humane Learning have peruſed it, and admir'd both it and its Author. No *Expoſition* or *Commentary* on the *New Teſtament* hath had that Univerſal Approbation that this hath had amongſt us, whether we ſpeak of profeſs'd Clergymen, or of Gentlemen converſant in good Letters. Which is an abſolute Argument of the Worth and Excellency of this Book, which a pert Critick hath ſo ſawcily attack'd.

Secondly, This *Tranſlating of the Book*, is a Confutation of all that hath been ſaid againſt it. For would any Man, who had any thing elſe to do, tranſlate a large Volume that is repleniſh'd with ſo many ill things? Would he take the pains to turn it into *Latin*, when he knows that it hath ſuch groſs Blemiſhes, Defects and

and Errors (and those wilful ones) in it? when he knows that it is a Confused and Perplexed Work, and is the Off-spring of a Man of dark Conceptions, and perplexed Thoughts and Notions? when he knows that there is want of Grammar and Criticism in it, and neglect of True Antiquity? when he knows that it abounds with False Quotations, and that it is stuff'd with Rhapsodies, Incoherences, and even Nonsence it self? when he knows and acknowledges that it is larded with False and Erroneous Doctrines in Divinity, and that, in order to that, sundry places of Scripture are wrested and distorted? and lastly, when he knows that his *Translation* can mend none of these things, but they must go into the world as they are? Can it be conceiv'd, I say, that a Man would take the pains to *translate* such a Volume? Nay, must it not needs be an unlawful Enterprize, to propagate such corrupt Notions, and wilful Wrestings of Scripture? What then shall we think of *Monsieur*'s Undertaking?

We can think no other than this, that he believes not what he saith concerning the Doctor and his Book; but only had a design to impose upon the World, and to gratifie some base Humour or Interest. Some Men, when they know themselves guilty of a fault, are wont to charge others with the like, as thinking thereby to divert Persons from taking notice

of their own: Or, it may be, he indulges herein his *Pedantick* Genius, which generally reigns in *over-buſie Criticks*, and renders them very troubleſome Creatures. It is likely he gratifies his *Pride*, which is another ill quality in impious *Criticks*: And this *Pride*, by his own confeſſion, being *the Parent of Mocking*, (p. 21.) we are not to wonder that he is ſo ſevere upon Dr. *Hammond*, and that he doth all he can to leſſen his Reputation; that he makes faults, and then diſcovers them; that he trips up the Doctor's heels, and then ſtands and glories in his fall.

Nor is it an improbable thought, that *Avarice* hath its part in this affair; for it may be obſerv'd, that a certain *Monſieur* is a Broker of Books, and makes Writing a Trade, witneſs his Parcel of *mere Collections* on the *Pentateuch*, borrow'd from about forty Authors. He muſt need rake up *all* things he can light on, to ſet up and carry on the Trade of *Book-making*. Thus to carry on this Work, he tranſlated Dr. *Hamond's Paraphraſe and Annotations* into *Latin*; and then he ſets out another Piece in *Engliſh*, to alarm us Iſlanders with the apprehenſion of the Improprieties and Barbariſms, and other defects of the *Engliſh Volume*, that ſo his **Latine Tranſlation** might ſell the better; becauſe we muſt ſuppoſe (if we will) that ſome of thoſe Barbariſms are corrected by him, though

though all the other Faults remain entire. He hopes that his *Supplement* will make amends for them, and cause the Book to go off as quick here, as in *all other Parts of Europe*, whither *a multitude of Copies are sent and dispersed*, as he informs us in his *Letter*.

Thus you see, when you search into the *Monsieur*'s Conduct in this matter, *viz.* of Vilifying Dr. *Hammond*'s *English* Work, you find that there is some very bad thing at the bottom. Whence also we have just ground to suspect this Gentleman's Performances for the future; we may fear they have some ill Design and Aim in them. But this we are sure of, that he can't be so utterly abandon'd to Stupidity, as verily to think and believe that what he hath vomited out against Dr. *Hammond*, and his Writings on the New Testament, is really true; for he contradicts this by his practice, namely, his spending so much Time and Pains in the *Translating* of them. Which any impartial Judge will say he would never have done, if he had indeed thought that they are every ways so bad and obnoxious as he represents them to be.

Thirdly, The Vanity of his *Exceptions* against the Doctor's *Paraphrase and Annotations*, and his own Vain and Impertinent *Additions*, will be a sufficient Confutation of all that he hath suggested against the Doctor and his Performances. I design, at present, to mention

but a few Particulars, becauſe I will leave the reſt to be handled in another Tongue afterwards. Now only I conſult the benefit of the *Reader*, by giving him a tranſient taſte of ſo many Paſſages in the *Monſieur's Supplement*, as will give him an inſight into the dangerous Genius and Drift of that Writer, and caution him againſt his Attempts for the future. The Order that I obſerve, is the ſame that the *Supplementer* makes uſe of in ſetting down his *Additions*, and therefore I need not now *page* it, as I did before.

On the Doctor's *Annotations* on the *Title of the Book*, he takes occaſion, from the word Διαθήκη, *Covenant* or *Teſtament*, to tell us, That this being but a *Metaphorical* Term, we muſt not underſtand it properly, and look for any conſiderable Agreement and Similitude between a *Covenant* or *Teſtament*, and what is tranſacted between God and Men. This is a good leading Notion for his purpoſe, and will be ſerviceable on ſeveral accounts afterwards; as when Chriſt is called a *Sacrifice*, and the like, it is but ſaying it is a *metaphorical* expreſſion, and therefore we muſt not think that really and truly Chriſt was a Sacrifice. For he lays down this Maxim, *It is ſufficient, if there be any Agreement, though but ſmall, between the thing of which any word is uſed in a metaphorical ſence, and that which it properly ſignifies.* But he

parti-

particularly applies this here to the word *Covenant*, and to this word as it is uſed in ſeveral other places of Scripture. Which can be done for no other end but this; to wit, to ſink the Reputation of the receiv'd *Doctrine of the Covenants*, which is grounded on the Holy Scriptures, and hath been ever aſſerted by thoſe that believe and reverence theſe Sacred Writings. He would, conformably to thoſe of his Perſuaſion, diſparage the *Firſt* and *Second Covenant* made with *Adam*: And ſo as for thoſe *Federal Acts* and *Signs* which we read of in the Old and New Teſtament, he hath a great mind to null them: He would not have us believe that *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſover*, that *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, are Religious Rites of that kind and nature; although ſome of theſe are in Scripture expreſly call'd *Covenants*, or *Signs* of them, and ſomething is ſaid of the reſt, whence we may rationally gather that they are Actions of that ſort. And accordingly, all the ancient Writers of the Chriſtian Church, together with all Divines in later Ages, have unanimouſly agreed to call them *Covenants*, or to ſpeak of them as *Federal Signs* and *Actions*.

But what ſaith our *Supplementer* to this? He moſt peremptorily and magiſterially dictates after this manner; *Whatever is ſaid about Federal Signs, by which God and Men do more cloſely bind themſelves to one another, being beſides*

Scripture, and not to be certainly concluded from the word Covenant, *is perhaps to be reckon'd among those things which Divines have more subtilly invented, than solidly proved.* Where first he excludes *all Federal Signs* and *Covenants* out of the *Scripture*, though they are so frequently mention'd there, in expres terms; and then he attributes it to *Divines*, that these Ties *by which God and Men* are vulgarly said *more closely to bind themselves to one another*, were *invented*. These *Divines* are a bold sort of Men, and full of Fictions; they take up things *besides Scripture*, and *uncertainly conclude from bare Words*. They are a flashy kind of People, *subtile Inventors*, but no *solid Provers*, and therefore who would attend to what they say about *Covenants?*

It may be further observed, That he shews his mean Thoughts and low Opinion of the Inspired Writers of the New Testament, when speaking of the sence of the word *Covenant*, mention'd in these Writings, he saith it must be understood in such a sence, (and there sets down what he fansies it is) *provided the Speaker can be thought to have a clear knowledge of things themselves*. Which is not spoken as if he were any great Admirer of the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, but rather argues, that he thought those Pen-men to be ignorant Folks, and such as understood not the things which they

they treat of in the Goſpels and Epiſtles. He comes with his faint *proviſo that they can be thought* to have any clear knowledge of what they deliver: Which is all one as if he had ſaid, *ſometimes it cannot be thought* that theſe Perſons write as they know or think. Which is an unworthy and ſcandalous Reflection on theſe Inſpired Writers, and ſuch as becomes not a Man that was undertaking to Expound and Interpret their Writings.

Thus we find, upon Examination, that whilſt the *Supplementer* ſtrikes at the Reverend *Annotator*, his Blows fall upon the *Authors* themſelves of the *New Teſtament*. Through the Doctor's Sides he worries the Scripture, and the beſt Interpreters of it, and deſigns an Innovation in the fixed Notions of Chriſtian Theology. We have ſeen how he ſets out at firſt, and we ſhall find his Progreſs to be proportionable. He intends to go on as he begun, with enervating the Scriptures, and laſhing the Clergy, and all Divines.

St. *Matthew*, chap. i. Here he propounds the opinion of *a good Friend of his*, (and this *good Friend*, it's likely, might be himſelf) *who thought that St.* Matthew *lighted upon a Genealogical Book of* David's *Family, that was defective*; and thence St. *Matthew's* Account of the Lineage and Deſcent of our Bleſſed Saviour comes to be Defective, and, in plain Engliſh, Falſe. But

what ſober Man would have entertain'd ſuch a groſs and impious Conceit as this, that the Evangeliſt begins his Goſpel with a Suppoſititious and Adulterate Genealogy? Who but *Monſieur Le Clerc* would have approved of ſo baſe and vile a Thought? *It looks* (ſaith he) *as if St.* Matthew *did cite a Book of this ſort, from whence he took all that follows.* It looks rather as if he were diſpoſed to ſlander St. *Matthew*, as well as Dr. *Hammond.* He was ſo intent on oppoſing the *latter*'s Interpretation and Solution, that he is not aſhamed to tell us, that the former was deceived and impoſed upon by a Falſe Genealogy; and though he was an Inſpired Writer, (and conſequently ſhould have penn'd nothing but what was Truth) yet he puts the World off with a mere Sham-Pedigree of our Saviour. Thus the *Supplementer* believes and vouches, what the Evangeliſt here delivers as a certain Truth, concerning Chriſt's Birth and Deſcent, to be fabulous, rather than he will accept of Dr. *Hammond*'s way (though a very good and ſafe one) of ſolving the ſeeming Difficulty. And here, in this his *Additional Annotation* on the Firſt Chapter of St. *Matthew*, he gives us to underſtand what courſe he will take in expounding the following ones, yea, all the other Evangeliſts; that is, he will entertain us with Fables and Fictions, with his own imaginary Conceits and Inventions, rather than

ſubmit

ſubmit to the Opinion of a Learned and Judicious Divine of the Church of *England*. There is ſmall hopes, you will ſay, of ſuch a Paraphraſt or Annotator.

St. *Matthew*, chap. ii. 15. *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken of the Lord by the Prophet*, &c. where he labours to prove that this Prophecy, and the reſt of that nature, were *not Prophecies*, and that they are not cited as ſuch by the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles. And yet nothing is plainer than this, that theſe Inſpired Writers frequently alledge them as Prophecies and Predictions, or elſe they would not particularly take notice of the *fulfilling* of them, as they always do, and for which very purpoſe they cite them out of the Old Teſtament. This *fulfilling* or accompliſhing of them being ſo frequently mention'd and urged by theſe Holy Men, argues that they were deſign'd by God to be *Prophetical* Declarations of ſomething that was to come to paſs. So that if we have any regard to theſe Sacred Writers, and their Authority, we muſt needs grant that ſuch like Paſſages were of the nature of *Predictions*.

But what ſaith *Monſieur* to this? He hath the confidence, expreſly to averr, That *the Authority of the Apoſtles ought not here to be objected, as that which added ſtrength to their Reaſonings*. This is ſomewhat ſtrange, ſeeing it comes from the Pen of one that pretends to Chri-

Chriſtianity, and therefore ſhould give very great Deference to the *Authority* of the Sacred Writers, and not any ways diminiſh it. But let us hear how he explains himſelf immediately after, in theſe words, *You will no where find it ſaid,* (and conſequently there is no ſuch thing, according to him) *that Prophecies ought ſo and ſo to be interpreted, becauſe the Apoſtles, who were Inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and whoſe Doctrine God confirmed by Miracles, did in that manner interpret them.* This is *Monſieur Le Clerc's* Logick, but no body's elſe; for though we do *no where find it ſaid* expreſly *that Prophecies ought to,* &c. yet any good Chriſtian Man would inferr as much, becauſe he knows he may ſafely depend upon the Authority of thoſe Inſpired Authors; and therefore when he ſees that theſe Perſons *who were Inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and whoſe Doctrine was confirmed by Miracles, did in that manner interpret* theſe Prophecies, he may with great reaſon conclude that *they ought ſo to be interpreted.* The particular Application of theſe Prophecies by the Holy Ghoſt, is to be attended to, and reverenced; and that ſufficiently vouches the Sence of them.

Wherefore, though *Hoſea's* words, here quoted by St. *Matthew,* were primarily meant concerning the People of *Iſrael's* Deliverance out of *Egypt*; yet we are to acknowledge that there

there was another, *i. e.* a ſecondary meaning of theſe words; for elſe the Evangeliſt, being directed by the Holy Ghoſt, would not have applied them after this manner, and taken notice that they were *fulfilled*. For, as our learned Dr. *Jackſon* hath rightly obſerv'd, *No Prophecy can be truly ſaid to be fulfilled only by way of Accommodation or Alluſion; for there is no Alluſive Sence of Scripture diſtinct from the Literal and Myſtical one*, [Vol. II. Book 7.]

We may then, notwithſtanding what the *Additional Annotator* ſaith, rationally and ſolidly argue from that ſence and meaning which we ſee is approved of by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, and back'd by the Authority of the Holy Pen-men. And queſtionleſs our *Monſieur* would have yielded to this, if he had not intended the Diſparagement of the Inſpired Writers, and if he had not a deſign to weaken the Cauſe of Chriſtianity, and to enervate the Prophetical Paſſages of the Old Teſtament, and to take the part of thoſe profeſſed Enemies of the Goſpel, *Celſus*, *Porphyrius*, *Julian*, who cried out, that St. *Matthew* had here miſerably perverted the meaning of the Prophet *Hoſea*, for his words were no *Prediction*, and therefore there could be no *fulfilling* of them. This is the very ſame that our *French Annotator* urges. And now judge whether he had any reaſon to find fault with Dr. *Hammond*'s Expoſition of the place, which

which was not derogatory to the Scripture, or the Inſpired Authors of it, as this Interpretation of the New Critick is.

St. *Matthew*, chap. iv. 1, &c. *Then was Jeſus led up of the ſpirit into the wilderneſs, to be tempted of the devil*, &c. Upon which the *Supplementer* hath this Conceit, that what is ſaid here, and in the following Narrative, *happened to Chriſt in a Viſion or Dream.* All that the Evangeliſt records concerning our Saviour's being tempted by Satan, was not a real thing, but only a Fancy and Imagination of our Lord in his Sleep. But one would rather think that the *Monſieur* was dreaming, when this came into his head: For here, in the firſt place, he forſakes the Common Rule which is approved of by all ſober Men, *viz.* That the plain and obvious ſence of Scripture is not to be abandon'd without good ground: But here is none at all. Next, the Notion of a *Dream* is caution'd againſt by the firſt word *Then, i. e.* preſently after Chriſt's Baptiſm; *Then* he was tempted in that manner which is afterwards deſcribed; to ſignifie to us, that this is an Orderly and Methodical Account of what was really done, and actually came to paſs. Again, If we conſult the Particulars, we ſhall find that the whole is *Hiſtorical*, and ſpeaks of real Matter of Fact, if there be any way of knowing what is ſuch, from the Relation which is given by a Writer.

Writer. Thus the Evangelist, as an Historian, but an Inspired one, relates distinctly Christ's *Fasting*, and the whole manner of his being *Tempted*, first *in the Wilderness*; then when the Evil Spirit *set him on a pinnacle of the Temple*; after that, when *he took him up into an exceeding high Mountain*. Here is particularly recorded what was *said* to our Saviour by the Devil, at these three times, and what Answer was return'd to him by him, and what was the result of the Temptation, *viz.* that *the Devil left him*, being baffled by him, and *Angels came and ministred unto him*. Every thing is set down in the way of a *Narrative* or *History*; yea, the very *precise Time* of our Saviour's *Fasting* is mention'd, to let us see it was a Reality. And truly, if we deny this, we may as well say that the rest of the Historical Passages in this and the following Chapters are *Dreams*, and so subvert the greatest part of the Gospel, yea, the Gospel it self. And besides, St. *Luke* relates the very same things concerning Christ's *Fasting* and *Temptation*, that St. *Matthew* doth, and hath not one word or syllable that gives any suspicion of what he saith concerning them to be a *Dream*. Add this to all that hath been said, That it is not to be doubted that the Apostle refers to this Signal *Temptation* of our Saviour, when he saith, *Heb.* ii. 18. *He himself hath suffered, being tempted*: And again,

in

in the same Epistle, *He was in all points tempted like as we are*, chap. iv. 15. Which no Man in his wits will believe was spoken of what was only in a Dream. So that there is not the least occasion given to the most fanciful head to imagine the contrary.

And as for our *Dreamer*'s arguing from the Devil's *taking Christ up into an exceeding high Mountain*, there is no force in what he saith; for the Devil could as well have *shewed him all the Kingdoms of the World, and the glories of them*, when he stood upon the lowest Ground, for all this *Prospect* was but a Delusion of the Sight. Which we are not to wonder at; for truly, if Satan was permitted by God to have such a Power on our Saviour's Body, as to carry it up aloft in the Air, and to place it on a Mountain, we may safely grant that he might suffer the Evil Spirit to have some Power and Influence on our Saviour's Organs of *Seeing*, as also upon the *Medium*: for this is no more derogatory to our Blessed Lord, than his *being Tempted*. Nor did Satan impose upon our Saviour by this; for our Saviour knew full well that they were but fictitious Representations in the Air, and he knew that the taking him up into so high a place, was but a Blind and Cheat, and that it was utterly impossible that the highest *Mountain* in the World should give a view of *all the Kingdoms* of it. But it fol-

follows not hence, that what is here related, is a Fiction or Dream, and that there never was any ſuch thing in reality as the Devil's Tempting Chriſt in this manner which is here ſet down by St. *Matthew*; for the contrary to this I have ſufficiently proved, and thereby evinced that our *New Expoſitor* is a Fanciful ſort of Man. And yet this is he that often objects to Dr. *Hammond* his fanciful Interpretations, and calls them *Dreams*, and ſometimes tells us that *he is ſcarce awake.* Which may convince any Man that *Monſieur* is reſolved (right or wrong) to reflect on the Doctor, and to carp at all he ſaith.

St. *Matth.* xi. 28. *Come unto me all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you reſt.* Which he ſaith *is to be underſtood only of the* Jews, *who were tired with their weary Journeys that the Law obliged them to make to* Jeruſalem. Theſe and the *Jewiſh Ceremonies* are the *only* things that are meant here: *Thoſe that underſtand Chriſt to ſpeak here of Vices, offer violence to the words*, ſaith this *French Annotator*, but without any ground either from the import of the *Greek* words here uſed, or from the thing it ſelf. The true ſignification of κοπιῶν is to labour with fatigue, to be weary and tired with labour and working, and therefore is applied to great Pains-takers, not only in Prophane Authors, but in the Wri-

tings

tings of the New Teſtament: Thus we find ὁ κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν, *the husbandman that laboureth*, 2 Tim. ii. 6. And it is applied to Day-labourers, and ſuch as get their livelyhood by the work of their hands, κοπιάτω, ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς χερσὶν, *let him labour, working with his hands*, Eph. iv. 28. This is the proper and genuine ſence of the word; but it is tranſlated from *Corporal* Labour and Toil, to that of the *Mind*; and ſo the κοπιῶντες in this place, are thoſe that labour in Mind, thoſe that are afflicted and troubled in their Conſciences, becauſe of their Sins: And theſe are the Perſons (and who ſo fit?) that are invited by our Saviour to *come unto him*. The other word, φορτίζεσθαι, in the proper ſence of it, is meant of the *Body* only, *viz.* when it is loaded or preſs'd with a Burthen; but it is applied to the Grief or Troubles of the *Soul*, which is as it were its heavy Burthen. And ſo this is a Metaphorical way of ſpeaking here, and is of the very ſame import with the foregoing one; and accordingly πεφορτισμένοι is thus paraphraſed by St. *Chryſoſtom*, οἱ ἐκ βάρους τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων κεκοπιωμένοι, *thoſe that labour and are wearied by reaſon of the burthen of their ſins*, [*Hom.* 5. *de Incomprehenſib. Dei Natura*,] ſuch as deeply mourn and grieve for their former miſcarriages, ſuch as have obtain'd to a *broken ſpirit* and a *contrite heart*, ſuch as pant and groan under

under the heavy Load of their Sins, such as become sensible of the slavery and drudgery of Vice, as also of the Wrath and Displeasure of God due to them for it. These are the κοπιῶντες and πεφορτισμένοι, *those that labour and are heavy laden*: And who would think that any Writer professing Christianity should question this?

And those who thus *labour* and are *heavy laden*, are so uneasie that they long for *Relief*; and therefore it is most fitly added, *I will give you Rest*, and afterwards, *Ye shall find rest unto your Souls*, for *rest* answers exactly to that *labouring* and *being heavy laden*. It is the Man whose Spirits and Strength are exhausted with Toil and Burden, that calls for *Ease*: and so it is the weary and over-burdened Sinner that cries for *Rest* and Refreshment. And therefore one would wonder at what this New Interpreter saith, that ἀνάπαυσις *cannot be applied here, if the place be understood of Vertue or Vice.* He talks e'en like a *Heathen Critick*, that is, like himself, who on another occasion, professes that *Grace is he knows not what.* Ars Critic. *cap.* 8. We are like to have good *Expositions* on the Sacred Text, when it is handled by such unwash'd Fingers. Who could expect any other *Criticism* and *Theology* than this, which he offers upon this place of St. *Matthew*, viz. That *Rest* is an improper term here, and that it cannot be applied to those that *labour under Vice?* And

from the whole it is plain, that this Writer had not at all ſtudied the Nature of Words or Things, when he declared that κοπιῶντες and πεφορτισμένοι are not applicable here to any Perſons but the *Jews*, and to their Rites and Ceremonies which they were burden'd with. I do not wholly exclude the Burden of the *Moſaick Law*, but 'tis certain that a greater and more intolerable one is here underſtood by our Saviour, who addreſſes himſelf in theſe words to all Sinful Men, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, that are weary of their Vices, and having a ſight and ſenſe of them, and feeling them to be a Burden, are heartily deſirous to quit them: and to theſe belongs that *Reſt*, that Relief and Comfort which the Bleſſed JESUS here mercifully offers to them. And this *Monſieur Le Clerc* would have moſt readily own'd, if he had not been ſomewhat Paganiſhly diſpoſed; or if he had not been too forward to contradict whatſoever the Learned and Pious Dr. *Hammond* ſaith.

St. *Matth.* 11. 30. *My yoke is eaſie.* Where he thinks that the Greek word χρηστὸς is ill tranſlated, either becauſe he hath a Mind to quarrel with the Dr. or to give us a caſt of his *Critical* Office. He will have χρηστὸς ſignifie *profitable*, not *eaſie* or *gentle*; and therefore he maintains that the word is not applicable to *Vertue* here. For it ſeems his foregoing

Miſtake

Miſtake about κοπιῶντες and περιεργαζομένοι, hath unhappily betray'd him into this Error and inconſequence. And by the way we may take notice what a ſavoury Notion he hath of Chriſtian Morality, as if *Profitable* were not a fit Epithet for *Vertue*. But he is as ſhallow in Criticks as he is in Ethicks, for notwithſtanding his great Pretenſions to Critick Art, he underſtands not the true meaning of the *Primitive* whence the word χρηστὸς comes, and ſo knows not how to apply it; and thence he thinks that χρηστὸς ought not to be rendred *eaſie* or *gentle*. But I will give him a more exact account of the word, than I find he hath yet met with: which in ſhort is this, that χρῆσις, whence χρηστὸς is derived, ſignifies *to uſe*; and becauſe we make *uſe* of things and perſons either for *profit*, or for *eaſe* and *delight*, the word χρηστὸς hath a double ſignification, and may be rendred either *utilis* or *facilis*, either *commodus* or *ſuavis*. Whence it appears, that our French Critick had no reaſon to exclude this latter ſignification of the word, and to be very warm in perſwading the Reader that ζυγὸς χρηστὸς muſt needs be tranſlated a *profitable Yoke*. There is no ground at all for this, ſeeing χρηστὸς is a word that is applicable to things or perſons that we can *uſe* or *enjoy* either with *pleaſure* or *profit*. Nay, take it barely as from χρῆσις *to uſe*, and it carries with it the

ſignification of *pleaſure* and *eaſineſs*; for as what we can *hardly make uſe of* is unpleaſant and uneaſie, ſo what is *with eaſe uſible*, is delightful and eaſie. Thus the word is tranſlated in our Engliſh Bibles, which Dr. *Hammond* follows, according to the true meaning of the word χρᾶσθαι, whence it comes: for ζυγὸς χρηστὸς is *jugum quo facilè uti poſſumus*. Thus we have the better of the Monſieur, if we reſpect the Critical import of the word.

But beſides, it is very obvious to take notice that the word χρηστὸς is here uſed in an *Emphatick* way; that is, with an alluſion to the nature of a *Yoke* (to which it is here applied) which is *hard* and *uneaſie*, but our Saviour by way of Antitheſis tells us that *his yoke* is *eaſie*, *pleaſant* and *gentle*. His Commands are not grievous, his Laws are not heavy and burdenſom, but whatſoever he hath enjoyn'd us in the Goſpel, is every way agreeable to the beſt Reaſon, and ſuitable to the rectified and reformed Nature of Man, and is both ſweet and lovely in it ſelf, and follow'd with laſting Pleaſures and Delights. And though our New Critick inſiſts that χρηστὸς muſt by all means be rendred *profitable*, I have already ſhew'd that this betrays great Unskilfulneſs: And moreover, I might remind him that the other acception of the word, *viz. pleaſant* or *amiable*, however he hath overlook'd it, is uſual with the

the beſt Authors. Not to mention the LXX. who often uſe the word χρηστὸς in this ſenſe, we read of χρηστὸν εἶδος, *pulchra forma*, quoted by *Stephen* and *Conſtantine*, out of *Herodian*. So in *Ariſtophanes* χρηστὸν ἔδεσμα, *ſuavis ſeu delicatus cibus*, and in *Homer* χρηστὸν μελίτωμα, *mellita placenta*. And it was *Budæus*'s Judgment (who 'tis thought was as good a Critick in Greek as *Monſieur Le Clerc*) that *ſuavis, jucundus, mitis* was the proper and genuine Signification of χρηστὸς, as *Stephen* upon the word atteſts, and quotes Authors, mention'd by *Budæus*, for it. Now, after all this, will any one deny that ζυγὸς χρηστὸς is not rightly and properly engliſh'd, *an eaſie* (*i.e.* a ſweet and pleaſant) *yoke*? The truth is, This Tranſlation is very proper and appoſite; and the other, which *Monſieur* hath taken up, is forc'd and ſtrain'd; ſo that he hath had as ill fortune with the word χρηστὸς, as he had with κοπιῶντες and πεφορτισμένοι.

S. *Matth.* 16. 18. *The gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Where the Greek αὐτῆς *it*, is referr'd by this Interpreter to τῇ πέτρᾳ, not τῇ ἐκκλησίαν: which is contrary both to Grammar, and to the Scope and Deſign of the Text. One may plainly diſcern that it is Ungrammatical, becauſe, according to the Common Rule and Practice of Grammarians, the Relative Pronoun αὐτὴ, ought to anſwer to the word of this Gender which was laſt mention'd in the

place, if the ſence will bear it, and that is ἐκκλησία: Whereas this great Pretender to Grammatical Orthodoxy refers αὐλὴ to πέτρα, which is a remote word, and therefore was not to be look'd to at this time. Whence we ſee how impertinently it was ſaid of him, that *it can't be evinc'd from this place, by Grammatical Reaſons, that the words are meant of the Perpetuity of the Church.* We find the quite contrary, *viz.* that it doth appear upon *Grammatical Reaſons*, that this Text is ſo to be meant. Only this Gentleman muſt be talking, ſomething muſt be ſaid and urged againſt Dr. *Hammond*, and his Interpretation of the place, and that under the ſhelter of *Grammar.* Whence we gather, that ſome *Grammarian*, beſides *Apion*, deſerves the name of *Cymbal*, becauſe he is ſo Noiſy, and duns Mens Ears with his vain and trifling, but confident Talk. We believe now, without any Diſpute about it, that that ſonorous *Inſtrument* was (as he ſaith, *p.* 352.) made of *Braſs.*

But not only the Laws of Grammar, but the very Scope and Driſt of the place make for Dr. *Hammond's* Interpretation againſt the *Monſieur*; for what can be plainer than this, that our Saviour intended here to expreſs the Duration of his Church? *It is built upon a Rock*, it is ſtable and immoveable, and ſhall continue through all Generations of the World, yea,

yea, though there ſhall be the moſt vehement Oppoſition made againſt it, not only by Men, but *Devils*. But though the very *gates of hell* make the moſt powerful reſiſtance againſt it, yet *they ſhall not prevail againſt it*; they ſhall never be able to over-power the Church of Chriſt. This is the natural and eaſie purport of the words: but how forced and foreign is that Senſe which *Monſieur* puts upon them? namely, That they are ſpoken of St. *Peter* only, and that when it is ſaid, *The gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt him*, the meaning is, *the danger of a certain and ſpeedy Death ſhould not deter him from diſcharging the Office impos'd on him; and ſo not Death it ſelf.* Which hath nothing of conſiſtency with what is here ſaid by our Saviour, who ſpeaks not of St. *Peter*, but of the *Church*. And that he doth ſo is evident, becauſe, if by *the gates of hell*, be only meant *Death* (as this Critick would have it, becauſe he meets with ſome ſuch Expreſſion in *Homer*) then this which our Saviour here ſaith concerning that Apoſtle, proved not true; for *the gates of hell prevailed againſt him* when he was put to Death by *Nero*; as Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory informs us. This is enough to ſhew the Invalidity of this Author's Interpretation of that place, and to let us ſee that he is as Unfortunate in his *Criticiſm*, as in his *Divinity*.

Chap. 18. verſ. 17. *Tell it unto the Church.* Upon which, *Monſieur* quotes four or five Pages out of Dr. *Hammond*'s Treatiſe of the *Power of the Keys*; and then, without ſo much as attempting to confute what he ſo largely cited out of him, he only tells us, That *Grotius upon the place is a great deal more plain and natural*; yet waves the Proof of it. And then adds, *The Doctor takes for granted what he ought to have proved, that Chriſt ſpeaks to his Apoſtles as the Governors of the Church.* All which ſhews, that it was his great Averſeneſs to the *Church* and *Church-Diſcipline*, and not any Reaſon that he hath on his Side, which made him ſhuffle thus; for if Dr. *Hammond* had ſaid any thing in his *Paraphraſe*, or *Notes*, or his *Treatiſe* about Eccleſiaſtical Government and Cenſures, which was Unſcriptural or Unreaſonable, *Monſieur*'s task was to confute it. But, *Pardonez moy*, this was not the thing deſigned by him, (becauſe it was impoſſible) but only an expoſing of the *Diſcipline of the Church*, and of the *Church* it ſelf. Wherefore in a wonderful civil manner he calls it, *the Bug-bear name of the Church*, in his Additional Notes on *Tit.* 3. 10. In another place, he ſaith, *Church-Diſcipline too often occurr'd to the Doctor's thoughts*, p. 6. *The Doctor thinks he can never ſay enough about Church-Cenſures*, p. 348. And frequently our *Supplementer* diſcovers his Antipathy to the *Officers of the Church*, to *Excommuni-*

communication, and to the *Sacred Function* it ſelf, as we ſhall ſee afterwards. We muſt not marvel, therefore, that he is ſo ſevere on the Doctor, when there is the leaſt mention of any of theſe things in his *Paraphraſe* or *Annotations*, and particularly in this place now quoted, *Tell it to the Church*: which without doubt is ſpoken of the Officers and Governors of the Chriſtian Church; though he ſtiffly denies it, without any Proof, as I obſerv'd before. But nothing can be more evident, than that the *Governors of the Church* are here meant by *the Church*; becauſe our Saviour here ſpeaks of that ἐκκλησία which hath the *Power of binding and looſing*, as you may ſee in the very next Verſe. Now, this Power is Entail'd by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, on a diſtinct and particular Body of Men, the Paſtors and Guides of Churches; or elſe we muſt aboliſh the diſtinction between the *Governors* of the Church, and *thoſe that are governed*: which I ſuppoſe the *Monſieur* never troubled his head about.

Chap. 18. ver. 35. In his Notes on this place, we have a Specimen of his marvellous Skill in Divinity; for he tells us, that we are not to think that *the Juſtice of God in its retributions will take notice of every ſingle Circumſtance in the Sins of Men.* Which is not taken out of *Syſtems*, but yet it is never the truer for that. Yea, we have reaſon to believe that it is very falſe;

falſe; becauſe *Circumſtances* are part of the *Aggravation* of Sins, and therefore cannot but be *taken notice of* by God, when it is his Pleaſure to animadvert ſeverely upon Sinners. Seeing *Circumſtances* inhanſe the guilt of the Perſon, it follows, that when the Juſt God ſhall *mark Iniquities* (as the Pſalmiſt expreſſes it) in order to the puniſhing of them, he will have an Eye to that which renders the Sin more grievous and heinous. And this New Divinity of our Author may be confuted from what we obſerve in the Sacred Writings, *viz.* that the particular and individual *Circumſtances* of Sin are mention'd and inſiſted upon by humble Penitents: and this hath always been the Practice of Devout Souls, in their private and ſecret Confeſſions of their Miſcarriages; their Acknowledgment of them before God, hath not only been in general, but in particular; and that with all their heightning Circumſtances. And the reaſon is, becauſe theſe being part of their Offences, the particular owning of them is ſerviceable to render them more ſenſible of their Guilt, more apprehenſive of their Unworthineſs and Vileneſs, and conduces to their greater and deeper Humiliation. All which argues, that *God in his juſtice takes notice of every Circumſtance in the Sins of Men*: otherwiſe true Penitents would not take notice of them, and make them the matter of their Confeſſion.

Ano-

Another Proof of our *Monſieur's* profound Theological Skill is what he in the ſame place delivers concerning *Pardon of Sin*, viz. that there is no ſuch thing in this Life. *It is then only*, he ſaith, *that God paſſes Judgment upon Men, when after the courſe of their Life is ended, they are ſent into the place of Rewards or Puniſhments. So that That is the time when Perſons are Pardon'd or Condemn'd, and there is no need of any previous Sentence.* Neither is this the Divinity of *Syſtem-makers*; and therefore it goes down Clock. But whether it be the Divinity of the Scriptures, we may judge from *Iſai.* 40. 2. *Tell her that her iniquity is pardon'd.* If the Sins of *Jeruſalem*, i.e. of the true Penitents there, were then actually forgiven, it follows that this was done before, and not *after the courſe of their Life was ended.* We may judge alſo of this Doctrine from our Saviour's Words to the Penitent Woman, *Thy Sins are forgiven*, Luk. 7.47. and from what the Apoſtle ſaith to the converted *Coloſſians*, Chap. 2. v. 13. *having forgiven you all treſpaſſes.* Where Forgiveneſs is declared to be ſomething that is *paſt*, and therefore is in *this life.* And our Saviour, who beſt knew the Time of Pardon, thus poſitively ſpeaks concerning himſelf, *The Son of man hath Power on Earth* (even in this ſtate of Humiliation, and conſequently in the preſent life) *to forgive Sins*, *Mat.* 9. 6. So that our New Annotator's Conceit

ceit hath no ground at all, but we may juſtly here apply to him what he ſaith of others, (and that in no very fine Language) *Men often mix their own rotten Inventions with divine Revelation*, Letter, *p.* 14. He is juſt ſuch a Theologiſt as he is a Critick; that is, he ventures at all, and ſaith what he pleaſes, and fanſies things himſelf, and then obtrudes them upon others.

Chap. 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the name of the Father*, &c. which he interprets thus, *baptizing them, that they may be called by the name of Diſciples of the Father*, &c. This is the true meaning, he ſaith, of that form of Speech εἰς ὄνομα, and he is ſo confident of this Notion, that he repeats it on *Joh.* 14. 14. *If ye ſhall ask any thing in my name, I will do it*, though it is not εἰς ὄνομα, but ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι in this place. However, it muſt bear the ſame ſenſe with him, and *to ask any thing in Chriſt's name* is, he ſaith, *to deſire what they would have granted to them, becauſe they were call'd, and were diſciples of Chriſt*. Which how foreign an Interpretation it is, any one may diſcern; and yet he boaſts of it as a great Acqueſt, and ſuch as *a great many underſtand not*: and *a great many Paſſages will receive light from this Interpretation*. One would think this ſhould not be forgotten by him, but that he ſhould *enlighten* ſome other Texts with it. One would think he ſhould ſtand

ſtand to his new-invented Conceit, and make uſe of it when the ſame form of Speech occurs in the New Teſtament. But we find no ſuch thing, the upſtart fancy is laid aſide, when he comes to Comment on *John* xvii. 12. where ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου is thus interpreted by him, *by a Power derived from thee:* and that without doubt is the true meaning; for our Saviour here ſaith, concerning thoſe that were *given to him of his Father*, that *he kept them in his Father's name*, he preſerv'd them both in Body and Soul by that Power and Authority with which he was commiſſioned by his Father. But now, according to *Monſieur's* former fit of interpreting, the words ſhould have been expounded thus, *I kept them in thy name*, i. e. *becauſe they were call'd by thy name, and were thy diſciples.* Nay, he forgets his Old-new Criticiſm again in his Comment on *Acts* iv. 7. where ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι is interpreted very roundly by him, *by whoſe Authority?* Whence we may obſerve, that he will not ſtick to his own Laws and Rules of Interpretation: he ſtarts a Notion, and then loſes it: he ſets it down, and then forgets it, and goes contrary to it. It is no marvel then that he is ſo buſie in running down other Mens Opinions, when he makes nothing of relinquiſhing his own. So Dr. *Hammond* be but oppoſed, he cares not what courſe he Steers.

St.

St. *Luke*, chap. iv. 9. *If thou be the Son of God.* Which are the words of the Devil to our Bleſſed Saviour; where *Monſieur* takes it for granted that no more is meant by *the Son of God* than this, That *Jeſus was conceived without the aſſiſtance of a Man, and by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt.* Which I take notice of only to remind the Reader how he ſhews his good will to that Cauſe which the *Unitarians* have eſpouſed, though he waves the *Title.* But before I diſmiſs him, I ſhall make it appear that he hath a right to the Thing it ſelf. At preſent I only obſerve how he abuſes the Devil, and wreſts his words, to his own purpoſe; for it is not to be queſtion'd that the Evil Spirit even from his firſt Apoſtacy from that Glorious State, wherein he had a Knowledge of the Sacred Trinity, and afterwards by ſeeing what Extraordinary things our Saviour did, knew ſo much of him, that though he here ſpeaks hypothetically, [*If thou be the Son of God,*] yet he directly and poſitively own'd him to be *the Son of God.* This we are aſcertain'd of, from *Mat.* viii. 29. and *Luke* iv. 41. where we have no reaſon to doubt that the Appellation of *the Son of God* denotes the *Divinity* of Chriſt; though *Mouuſieur Clerc* would here teach the Devil to deny it.

St. *John*, chap. i. 1, &c. Where his Paraphraſe plainly ſhews, that he is not of opinion that the beginning of this Chapter ſpeaks of a *Second*

cond Perſon in the Trinity. Much like a *Quaker* he deſcants on this part of the Chapter, and according to their way of talking on Theological Points, he is ambiguous and fluttering, and made up of Artifice and Deſign. He makes the firſt Verſe ſpeak to this purpoſe, *In the beginning was the Reaſon, and Reaſon was with God, for God never was without Reaſon, and the Reaſon was God, for all that is in God is God.* The 3d. Verſe, *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made,* he interprets thus, *In St.* John, *all things are ſaid to have been made by Reaſon, in the ſame manner as if it were ſaid, the World was created by the divine Power, which words do not ſignifie an inſtrument diſtinct from God.* Than which nothing could be ſaid plainer to diſcover his Mind, *viz.* that the Λόγος is no Diſtinct Perſon in the Godhead, and conſequently that there is no Trinity in it. And to let us know that he takes not the Λόγος for a *Perſon,* he conſtantly renders αὐτὸς (which is ſpoken of Him) not *he* or *him,* but *it:* Thus *v.* 3. *All things were made by it, and without it was not any thing made,* &c. And ſo *v.* 4. inſtead of *in him was life,* he tranſlates it, *in it was life:* And ſo δι' αὐτοῦ, is rendred *by it*; v. 10. *the World was made by it, and the World knew it not:* And *v.* 11. *It came to its own, and its own received it not:* And *v.* 12. *but as many as received*

ceived it, to them gave it Power to, &c. which *it* being ſo often repeated, clearly manifeſts that he look'd not on the Λόγος, mention'd by St. *John* as a *Perſon*, but as a *Quality* only: and yet how a *Quality* ſhould *make the World*, and *come to his own*, and *give Power*, &c. (which are all Perſonal acts) is a thing that can never be reconciled. Yet there are thoſe that will hold to that Doctrine rather than they will own the proper *Perſonality* of the Λόγος. The *Monſieur* bids fair (one would think) for one of that ſort, and yet you muſt not call him a *Socinian*, or an *Unitarian*; he is mad at you, if you uſe ſuch Language. He is ſo idle and vain as to brag here that *he hath confuted* Socinus; but if he would have utter'd the plain and juſt Truth, he muſt have ſaid, he varied from *Socinus's Way* of interpreting the beginning of St. *John's* Goſpel, but he holds the *ſame thing* in the main.

St. *John*, chap. xvii. 3. *This is life eternal that they may know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* On which words, which are often objected by the *Unitarians* againſt the contrary Party, he labours to gratifie his Friends, by preventing the uniting of theſe words by the Conjunction καὶ; which, if we apply aright, makes againſt the *Socinians:* and accordingly he betakes himſelf to his *Critick Art*, and would perſwade us that the

the Article τὸν before μόνον must be repeated before the word Χριστὸν, and then he translates it thus, *that they may know thee, who art the only true God, and Jesus whom the Christ that thou hast sent.* How he saith it, as if the sense were expres'd thus, *that they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messias whom thou hast sent.* Where he is neither good *Critick* nor *Translator.* Not the *former*, for from divers Examples it might be proved that there is no need of inserting that Article before Χριστὸν, for Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, are by way of *Appositon*, as Grammarians speak; and therefore are not to be parted in the Translation, as this Author absurdly attempts. Wherefore he is not this *latter*, I mention'd, *i. e.* he is no good *Translator*, for he separates those words in a Sentence which ought to be join'd. And hereby also he marrs the sense of the place, for the bare *knowing* of God the Father *to be* the true God, and knowing Jesus *to be* the Christ or Messiah, is not *life Eternal.* There is a higher *Knowledge* than this meant here, *viz.* on *acknowledging* and *owning*, a *believing in*, and *obeying* God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ; as the word *Knowing* is sometimes taken, and as the very Reason of the thing dictates to us; for *life Eternal* is not promised to bare Knowledge, but to something else.

And here, before I quit this Particular, I would remind the Reader what sorry Pretences our Critick makes to Grammar and Syntax, when he can't distinguish between the *Indicative* and *Infinitive Mood*, as is manifest from his own plain words in this place, *It is as if the sense were expressed by the Infinitive Mood*; and then explains himself, *As if it had been said in Greek*, ὅτι εἷς ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς, ᾧ ὃν ἀπέστειλας, &c. Where it is clear that there is no *Infinitive*, but an *Indicative* Mood; and yet our most profound Grammarian tells us tidings only of the former. If one should look into his other Writings, he might discern what a heavy Ungrammatical Fist he hath, wherewith he makes nothing of breaking *Priscian*'s Head, and I don't find that he gives him a *Plaster*; for I look'd into his *Errata's* both before his *Commentary* on *Genesis*, and those at the End of the whole Work; but I saw no Amendment of his false *Latin* in the beginning of his *Dissertatio de Statuâ Salis*, where he hath these words, *Uxor Loti in perpetuum mansisse in Sodomitico agro, seu illic diriguisse, neq; unquam reversa intelligetur*, p. 328. And in other places *Priscian* lies bleeding; but that may be the Diversion of the Reader another time, seeing he hath been pleas'd to find fault with Dr. *Hammond*'s *Latin Dissertations*.

St. *John*,

St. *John*, chap. xx. 28. *Thomas anſwered and ſaid unto him, My Lord, and my God.* On which place our Critick confeſſes, that it is as much as if that Apoſtle had ſaid, *Thou art my Lord, and thou art my God.* But ſee how he interprets it after the *Poliſh* mode: the meaning of the words is this, he ſaith, *I acknowledge thee to be truly the ſame Lord whom I before followed, and not a man only, but to be alſo God, in as much as thou haſt overcome Death, which keeps all Men under its Power.* This is all the meaning of *Lord* and *God*. Chriſt is ſaid to be *God* here, becauſe *he overcame Death*: This is all the Account our *Supplementer* can give of our Saviour's Divinity: and for the ſame reaſon *all Men* may be call'd *Gods*, for they *overcome Death* at the Reſurrection, and are no longer *kept under its Power*. If you ſay, they do not riſe by their own Power, the very ſame is ſaid by the *Socinians* (as every one knows) concerning Chriſt. Here then is a poor ſlender *Divinity* (ſuch as *every mortal Man* is capable of) attributed by this Writer to the Eternal Son of God. But ſuch moſt certainly was not intended in this Text by St. *Thomas*: he plainly and expreſly gives *Chriſt* the Title of *God*, without any ſuch Reſtriction and Limitation as this Author mentions: and therefore this *Name* being *abſolutely* given him, we can infer no leſs than this, that Chriſt is the true Eternal Supream God. And

our Saviour knowing that the Apoſtle ſpoke right when he ſaid ſo, doth not correct him for it; which certainly he would have done, nay, muſt needs have done, if he were not *God*, if he were falſly ſtiled ſo by St. *Thomas*. But our Critical Gentleman was to promote (as much as he could) the *Cauſe*, and therefore we are not to be ſurprized at his Notes on this place; we are not to think it ſtrange that he preferrs a *Racovian* to an *Engliſh Paraphraſt*. The *Cauſe* is concern'd, that is reaſon enough.

Epiſtle to the *Romans*, chap. viii. 23. Here he takes occaſion to vent a new Piece of Theology; namely, That *Adoption* (the great and ineſtimable Privilege of all the Faithful) is not in this Life. It is only at the laſt day, he ſaith, for he defines *Adoption* to be *that ſolemn Acknowledgement of the Sons of God, which will be made at the Day of Judgment*. This is after the rate of that Scheme of Divinity, which makes *Pardon of Sin* the Privilege not of this Life, but of the laſt Day. But as I made it clear before, that this is a groſs Miſtake, ſo now it is as eaſie to prove that the other is ſo; for we muſt know that *waiting for the Adoption*, which is the Paſſage that he here relies upon, is *waiting for the full manifeſtation of it*; and therefore is expreſly call'd *the manifeſtation of the Sons of God*, v. 19. So that we ſee St. *Paul* explains himſelf, and thence we rationally gather, that though this

Mani-

Manifeſtation will not be till the actual Poſſeſſion of the Inheritance, *viz.* at the cloſe of the Laſt Judgment; yet *Adoption* is actually conferr'd on all Believers when they are ſanctified and juſtified. And therefore the Apoſtle thus ſpeaks to the Converted *Romans*, *As many as are led by the Spirit of God*, (*i.e.* as many as are ſanctified in their Hearts and Lives) *they are the Sons of God*, Rom. viii. 14. they are his *Adopted* Children. So then, if they be *led by the Spirit* in this Life (as all regenerate Perſons are) they are Adopted in this Life; and therefore it follows in the next Verſe, *Ye have* already *received the Spirit of Adoption.* And the like he ſaith to the *Galatians*, Chap. iv. 6. *Ye are Sons*; that is, ye have *receiv'd the Adoption of Sons*, as 'tis in the foregoing Verſe. And another Apoſtle puts it beyond all doubt, that this Filial Relation to God is the acquirement of this preſent Life, 1 *John* iii. 2. *Now are we the Sons of God.* That NOW is ſpoken Emphatically, to let us know that *Adoption* is the Attainment of this preſent State, though it be not perfected till we be admitted into Glory. This, I think, is enough to baffle what our new Pretender to Theological Points offers on the forecited Text. This only may be further obſerved here, that what he ſaith often of Dr. *Hammond*, may be juſtly applied to himſelf, that *his Memory fails him*; for he had ſaid, *I have purpoſed not to meddle with*

the Theory of Divinity, p. 218. but we ſee that here, as well as in other places, he intermixes it with his Critical Notes.

Rom. xiii. 9. He finds fault with what the Doctor ſaith on this place, *viz.* That the Duty of Subjects to Kings and Rulers is comprehended under the Fifth Commandment. *I cannot tell*, ſaith *Monſieur*, *whether any one can Prove that the Fifth Commandment requires us to pay that honour which is due to Magiſtrates.* But it is ſtrange he ſhould be ſo ignorant, when it is ſo eaſie a thing to Prove what he calls in queſtion. There are theſe Three Reaſons which may convince any unprejudiced Man, that the Fifth Precept of the Decalogue, viz. *Honour thy Father and thy Mother*, includes in it our Duty to Magiſtrates and Superiours.

Firſt, Becauſe the firſt *Governours* and *Rulers* were *Fathers* and *Mothers* of Families. It is acknowledg'd by all that the firſt Dominion was founded in Heads of Houſholds. Parents were the Primitive Soveraigns, and thence it is accountable and reaſonable that ſuch a Stile as this ſhould be uſed here; and that under *Fathers* and *Mothers* ſhould be comprended, not only Natural but Civil Parents, all that have a Superiority and Authority over us.

Secondly, There is this Reaſon alſo; becauſe thoſe that are in any degree *above* us, whether as to Age, or Worth, or Authority, are in Scripture

pture call'd by the name of *Fathers*, *Gen.* xli. 43. & xlv. 8. 2 *Kings* ii. 12. & v. 13. & vi. 21. & xiii. 14. The word of Publick Applause to *Joseph*, when he was exalted by *Pharaoh* to be his Vice-Roy, was *Abrech*, Gen. xli. 43. which by the *Targums* is rendred *a tender Father*, as if they thought that to be a fit Appellation for a great *Ruler*. So *Judg.* xvii. 10. *Ab*, *Father* is a word to express *Authority*, *Be unto me a Father*, *i.e.* preside over me, and command me by reason of thy Office and Dignity. So there is a *Spiritual Fatherhood*, 1 Cor. iv. 15. Philem. *ver.* 10. Yea, 'tis observable that Spiritual Guides and Pastors compare themselves to *Mothers*, Gal. iv. 19. And the title of *Mother* is also applied in the sacred Style to Civil Superiours, *Judg.* v. 7. *I arose a Mother in Israel*; that is, a Governess, a Judge, a Ruler. And in *Isai.* xlix. 23. *Kings* are call'd *Nursing-Fathers*, and Queens *Nursing-Mothers*; for though *Fathers* and *Mothers* are not in the *Original*, yet they are included in the words that signifie *Nursing*, because heretofore Parents nurs'd their own Children; and particularly, *Mothers* gave Suck to their own Infants. That of *Philo*, shews it was a *Jewish* way of speaking, Κοινοὶ πόλεων καὶ ἐθνῶν γονεῖς ἄρχοντές εἰσιν ἀγαθοί, De Creat. Princip. *Good Rulers are the common Parents of Cities and Nations.* Now seeing it appears that it is congruous to the Language of the Holy Writ to

call *Superiours*, whether Secular or Spiritual, by the name of *Fathers* and *Mothers*, we have ground to interpret the Fifth Commandment in this manner.

Thirdly, It is reaſonable to believe that Rulers and Governours are meant in this Precept, becauſe, if the Duty that is owing to theſe, and ſo reciprocally of theſe to thoſe that are under them, be not included in this Commandment, we can find it in no other part of the Decalogue, and conſequently it is not there at all; which is a thing that no conſiderate Man will admit of. For it is a Natural and Moral dictate that we ſhould Honour and Obey thoſe that are our lawful Superiours, and therefore it was taken into one of the Seven Precepts of the Sons of *Noah*, (as they are call'd) *viz.* That *concerning Judgments*, wherein the Magiſtrate's Office and the Peoples Duty to him were included. And can we think then that in the Decalogue, which is a more Conſummate rehearſal of Moral Precepts, the Duty which is owing to Rulers is not inſerted? No, by no means. And therefore this Commandment hath been thought by all Expoſitors, Ancient and Modern, Popiſh and Proteſtant, to expreſs that Duty which is to be paid to Superiors of any kind ſoever; whether Natural, Civil, or Eccleſiaſtical. And none would queſtion this, but one that knows not whether he be a Papiſt or a Proteſtant, and

one

one that cares not how much the Commandments are undervalued. If we conſult his *Commentary* on *Exod.* xx. we ſhall find that he hath but mean Thoughts of the *Decalogue*, he looks upon it as a ſhrivel'd and lank thing. He tells us, That in the Firſt Commandment, *God only tacitly aſſumes that he is to be worſhipp'd*, and that this Precept doth not concern *all Mankind, as ſome Divines think.* And as he dealt there with the Firſt Commandment of the *Firſt Table*, ſo here in a reſembling manner he treats the Firſt of the *Second Table*; he repreſents it as a mean and contracted thing, and ſtrikes the *Duty owing to Superiors* quite out of it. The *States* of *Holland* ſurely will give a Man, who ſojourns among them, no thanks for ſuch Doctrine as this.

Then take notice of his gift of *Nonſence* in thoſe words, *There is the ſame reaſon indeed for both, but they are not required in the ſame Precept.* If you conſult what goes before, you will find that there is but one thing mention'd, viz. *Honour due to Kings and Magiſtrates*, not a Syllable of any thing elſe, and yet here he talks of *both*, and ſaith, *they are not required.* We may ſay here, as he often ſaith of Dr. *Hammond*, *His Thoughts were upon ſome other thing*; or rather, he was ſo intent upon his excluding of Magiſtrates out of the Fifth Commandment, that he did not mind what he ſaid. Truly, there

there are ſome Paſſages in this *Supplement*, beſides this, that argue him to have (like his Friends) a very ill Opinion of *Magiſtrates*, eſpecially if they make uſe of their Coercive Power. It is thought that ſome Folks would not only ſhut them out of the Fifth Commandment, but out of the World. But we ſee that a Man can't talk againſt Magiſtrates, and ſpeak Senſe; as is here exemplified in our Author; he ſaith *both*, when he had been ſpeaking of one ſingle thing: he ſaith, *they*, when there is only one thing to refer it to. But this is not the firſt time of his trading in this ſort of Commodity, witneſs, *p.* 277. *There never really happen'd any thing that was wonderful almoſt but*, &c. To ſay a thing is *wonderful almoſt*, is altogether to be wonder'd at by thoſe that look for good Senſe. If he could have lighted on ſuch inſtances of a ſtudied Stile in Dr. *Hammond*, we ſhould have had it from him with mighty Exultations. Yet this is the Accurate Grammarian, the Nice Critick that ranſacks for all kinds of Faults in the Doctors Stile and Phraſe.

1 *Corinth.* chap. iii. verſ. 2. On which words the Reverend and Learned Doctor ſpeaks of *Excommunication*, becauſe the Text it ſelf doth, as the generality of the moſt Judicious Expoſitors acknowledge; yea, *Grotius* himſelf (whom *Monſieur* ſo preferrs to the Doctor) confeſſes, that this place ſpeaks of Excommunication.

cation. But our ſingular Writer, who is as much againſt *Excommunication* as againſt *Magiſtrates*, and that for the ſame reaſon, tells us, that the Doctor interprets the place after this manner, for the ſake of *his Diſputation, which he had ſometime before compos'd, about the Power of the Keys, which he was very much in love with, and perhaps more than he ſhould have been; and that made him think he ſaw thoſe Keys where no body elſe would ever have thought of them.* Yes, ſeveral learned Commentators, of chief Note, *have thought of the Keys here*, or elſe they would not have diſcours'd of them, or at leaſt mention'd them on this place: So that what he here ſuggeſts, is a very palpable Falſhood. And therefore I will only retort upon himſelf, what he ſaith, thus, *He interprets this place conformably to his Perſuaſion which he had ſometime before taken up againſt the Power of the Keys, which he was very much in love with, and certainly more than he ſhould be; and that made him think he did not ſee thoſe Keys where any body elſe would have thought of them.*

1 *Corinth.* chap. v. ver. 9. he hath this indecent and irreverent paſſage, *Should we have been ever the leſs Diſciples of Chriſt, if any of thoſe Epiſtles* (*viz.* of the *Apoſtles*, which he mention'd immediately before) *had been loſt, which we now have?* He not only ſuppoſes ſome Epiſtles to be loſt, and particularly one to the

Corin-

Corinthians, concerning which, he is ſo freakiſh and bold as to ſay, *There might be reaſons for the tearing and burning it after it was read*; but he lets us know his mind further, that if they were All of them loſt, torn and burnt, it were no great matter. Which is another proof of his great eſteem of thoſe Sacred and Inſpired Writings, which are of ſuch uſe in the Chriſtian Church, and therefore could not be ſpared, though this Gentleman thinks otherwiſe. Nor can we ſuppoſe that the watchful Providence of God would ſuffer a total loſs of this Incomparable Treaſure of the Church. But it is likely that *Monſieur* is of the mind of ſome of late, who would perſuade us, that the Great and Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith are not to be ſought for in the Apoſtolical *Epiſtles*, becauſe they are (as they ſay) only *Occaſional* Writings. Men of the ſame kidney, naturally fall into the ſame Notions and Sentiments, though they be ſeparated from one another by the *Herring-Pond*, or be at the greateſt diſtance from one another, and never ſaw one another's Faces, and it may be not their Writings. And the true reaſon of their ſymbolizing in this matter, is this, there are ſome particular Doctrines in thoſe *Epiſtles* which they have no good liking of, and thence they ſpeak ſo contemptibly of the *Epiſtles* themſelves, and would perſuade Perſons, that if they were all loſt, no body

body would be a whit the worſe for them, we may be *as much the Diſciples of Chriſt* as if we had them. But I hope no Man that hath a ſenſe of the true Nature of theſe Inſpired Writings will entertain ſuch a thought: For it is certain that we could not be *the Diſciples of Chriſt*, if we had not thoſe Doctrines from theſe Epiſtles, or from God by ſome other way of Revelation.

1 *Corinth.* chap. x. ver. 3. *They did all eat of the ſame ſpiritual meat.* That is, according to Dr. *Hammond*, (and moſt rightly) they did all eat of the Manna which had a ſpiritual and myſtical ſignification; for it repreſented Chriſt, the true Manna. And who would think of any other Interpretation? None but our *Supplemental Annotator*, who is pleas'd to reject what the Doctor ſaith, and will not allow that *Manna is call'd Spiritual Food, becauſe it repreſented or alſo typified Spiritual things.* And the Reaſons he gives of his Opinion are as weak, as his Rejection was bold; for this is one thing that he alledges, That *the Jews did not underſtand the Manna, and other things, to be Myſtical Repreſentations:* But he only ſaith this, and doth not trouble himſelf to prove it; for he could not but know that it is generally acknowledged by the *Jewiſh Maſters*, that the Scripture contain'd *Myſteries* in it, and that a *Secondary* as well as a *Primary*

ſence

ſence was to be looked for in ſeveral Texts. And it is confeſs'd, over and over again, by the *Jewiſh Rabbins*, in their Writings, that the Perſon and Office of the *Meſſias*, and the Privileges and Benefits that accrue by him, are expreſs'd by *Types* in the Old Teſtament. Another Reaſon of his Aſſertion he pretends to be this, That *Chriſtians have firmer Grounds, and more convincing Arguments for Chriſtianity*, and therefore *Typical Prefigurations* were uſeleſs. Which is a very fallacious way of Arguing, and becomes not any ſerious Diſcourſer; for the Sacred Writings make uſe of divers kinds of Arguments and Proofs, but all of them dictated by the Holy Spirit. It is not for us to determine which are *firmer* and *more convincing* than others? This we are ſure of, that they are all firm and convincing in themſelves, and fitted to the grand purpoſe they were deſign'd for, *i. e.* to prove and eſtabliſh the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

Well, but what Interpretation doth *Monſieur* give us of the foreſaid Text, after he hath rejected that of Dr. *Hammond*? Why truly, he can think of no other than this, That the *Manna* is call'd *Spiritual, becauſe it was prepared by Spirits, that is, Angels, whoſe Bread therefore it is ſaid to be*, Pſal. lxviii. 2. But he need not have conſulted the Pſalmiſt, whoſe words are foreign to his buſineſs. If he had but caſt his

eye

eye on the next Verſe in this x^th Chapter of the 1ſt. Epiſt. to the *Corinthians*, he might have been convinced of his miſtake: For after the Apoſtle had, in the Verſe before-mention'd, told them, that the Iſraelites *did all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat*, he adds immediately, that *they did all drink the ſame ſpiritual Drink, for they drank of that ſpiritual rock*, &c. What! muſt we hold that this *Rock*, and the *Drink* it afforded, were made by Spirits too? No; the Apoſtle is a better Commentator on his own words, than our Critick; for he aſſures us, that *that rock was Chriſt*, i. e. as *Grotius* expreſly interprets it, prefigured Chriſt, or was a Type of Chriſt. For the Apoſtle plainly ſhews the meaning of that Epithet which he gave to the *rock*, it was *ſpiritual*, becauſe it ſignified and repreſented a Spiritual Thing or Perſon. This is ſo clear, that *Monſieur* doth not pretend that *ſpiritual* is to be underſtood in this Verſe, of *Spirits* or *Angels*; and why then doth he underſtand it ſo in the former place? There can be no Reaſon aſſign'd for this, becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks in the ſame ſtrain in both places, and applies the word *ſpiritual* after the ſame manner in both Verſes, as any ſober-minded Man will acknowledge. Ay, but *Monſieur Le Clerc* would agree to this, and own a *Typical* Prefiguration in theſe words; but much dealing in Criticiſm, and more of ſomething elſe, hath made

made him of another opinion. He will not hold, that the *Rock* repreſented any Divine or Spiritual thing, but he looks upon the Apoſtle's words as a mere *Accommodation* or *Alluſion*, as if the Apoſtle here did only refer to that paſſage in the Old Teſtament, and apply it, after a faſhion, to his preſent purpoſe.

Yea, he is not afraid or aſhamed to tell it openly, that *the Apoſtle's way of ſpeaking* here, is derived from the *Jews*, *who frequently alluded to the Stories of the Old Teſtament, ſo as often to apply the words of them to their purpoſe, becauſe they thought it a piece of Elegance to appear to take every thing out of the Old Teſtament.* Where we ſee what high and brave Conceptions the *Monſieur* hath of St. *Paul*, and other Sacred Writers of the New Teſtament: We ſee what noble thoughts he entertains concerning theſe Great and Inſpired Authors. They fetch in things about the *Manna*, and about the *Rock*, and other ſuch like *Stories* in the *Old Teſtament*, and make uſe of them as they pleaſe, and to what end and purpoſe they think fit; not becauſe they are at all pertinent, and to the buſineſs, and ought to be applied to the thing they treat of, but only becauſe it was a faſhionable thing among the *Jews* to borrow ſome ſcraps out of the *Old Teſtament* upon all occaſions, and they fanſied it was an Ornament and Embelliſhment to their Diſcourſes to hook in ſomething from

theſe

theſe Writings. Theſe are the worthy Apprehenſions of our Good Critick, and he ventures to publiſh them to the World, rather than he will own any *Types*, and particularly rather than he will acknowledge *the ſpiritual Meat and Rock*, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, to be *Myſtical* and *Typical*, *i. e.* to ſignifie ſome other thing. Notwithſtanding the Reality and Uſefulneſs of this Doctrine of *Types*, which is confirm'd by the Apoſtles Writings, and eſpecially from the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, he cries out, *Let all this Doctrine about the Types alone*; and thereby he doth great diſſervice to the Chriſtian Religion, which we may fear was his Deſign, in beating down ſo receiv'd and approved a Sentiment.

1 *Corinth.* chap. xvi. verſ. 22. he falls upon Dr. *Hammond* for what he ſaith here concerning *Excommunication*. *Our Author*, ſaith he, *was too great a favourer of Eccleſiaſtical Puniſhments, which yet, it is certain, have done more miſchief than good to the Chriſtian Church.* It ſeems then they have done *ſome good*, and why then hath he ſuch an antipathy againſt theſe Church-Cenſures, and will not ſuffer them to be found in any place in the *Apoſtles Epiſtles*? no, nor in the *Goſpel*; for, *Tell it to the Church*, hath no reſpect to any ſuch thing, he voucheth. He ſaith in his *Letter* before his *Supplement*, That *he hath not any where oppoſed the Doctrines of the Church of England*: I appeal to the Reader,

whether *Excommunication* be not a Doctrine of the *Church of England*, (as it is indeed the Doctrine and Practice of all the *Reformed Churches*) and whether *Monsieur Le Clerc* hath not *opposed* it. So that we are not to rely upon what he saith; and besides, we see what little reason he hath to be so rough with a Divine of the Church of *England*, as often as he speaks of *Excommunication* and *Church-Discipline*, when these are founded in expres's Texts of Scripture, and are put in execution by all *Protestant Churches* when there is a just occasion for them.

2 *Corinth.* chap. vii. ver. 8. Here again our Writer is fallen into the same Theme; for this is one of his Common Places that he ekes his *Supplement* out with. *Unless our Author*, saith he, *had here look'd for Church-Censures of all kinds, he would not have had one word to say upon this Chapter*: Though it is very evident, that the Apostle referrs here to that Discipline; and the most sagacious Expositors agree in this. But this Gentleman is dreadfully scared at the least hint of *Excommunication* or *Church-Discipline*, especially if it come from Dr. *Hammond*. In other places of this Second Epistle he is very sharp upon him on the same account, he objects to him *his too great desirousness to find Excommunication every where spoken of in the Writings of the Apostles*. On *chap.* x. *ver.* 4.

ver. 4. But rather thus, we are to blame *Monsieur's too great desirousness to find Excommunication no where in the Writings of either Apostles or Evangelists.* The true bottom of which is this, He and his Complices, as they briskly remonstrate against all Punishments which the Civil Magistrates may inflict on them, so they would be exempt (whatever they do) from all Ecclesiastical Animadversion. This is that they drive at.

Ephes. chap. iv. ver. 30. *Grieve not the holy Spirit of God.* Which *Monsieur* expounds thus; *By the holy Spirit, here seems to be meant the gifts of the Holy Ghost conferred by God on the Ephesians.* He complains of the *harsh* and *forced* Interpretation of the Doctor very often: But doth not this Interpretation deserve those Epithets? Yea, there is more than *harshness* and *force* in it; for there is a Design carried on, as any one may discern, in this *Supplement*, where all the Texts that refer to the Sacred *Trinity*, or any *Person* of it, are made to speak the Language of *Cracow*. What reason can be assign'd, why, by *grieving the Spirit*, he understands *grieving the Gifts of the Spirit*? What reason, I say, can be given of this absurd Interpretation but this, that he is not willing to own the Holy Ghost to be a distinct Person in the Godhead? And because he saw that this would be taken notice of as an absurd and ridiculous

Expoſition, he labours to palliate the Abſurdity of it, by ſaying, *Becauſe theſe Gifts were beſtowed by a Perſon, viz. God, therefore the Epheſians are forbidden here to grieve them.* Which is as ridiculous as one could expect from him: For 'tis as if he had ſaid, The *Epheſians* are bid not to grieve or diſpleaſe the Gifts of the Spirit, becauſe they were given to them by God. Such uncouth and wild jargon is the *Monſieur* guilty of, rather than he will ſubmit to the Orthodox Faith of the Chriſtian Church.

On *Philip.* chap. i. ver. 1. and in other places of this Epiſtle, he laſhes the Doctor, for his Doctrine of *Epiſcopacy*. He had teaz'd him once and again for his *Excommunication* and *Church-Cenſures*, and now 'twas high time to drub him for the Antichriſtian Notion of *Epiſcopal Government*. He takes no notice of the Hiſtorical paſſages which the Doctor produces in Defence of it; and it is obſervable, that he makes no formal Return to his Arguments which he offers on other Texts to this purpoſe. And why not? Becauſe Dr. *Hammond* was a *Presbyter*, and in a fair way to be in an *Higher Order*, and therefore he was not to be attended to, but wholly deſpiſed when he talk'd of *Church-Government*. This is his way of Reaſoning in this place, as his own words teſtifie; *Biſhops, or Presbyters aſpiring to that Dignity* (viz. of Biſhops) *cannot always ſafely be heard in*

their own Cauſe. Nay, they cannot ſafely be heard *at any time*, as he repreſents them every where. Particularly upon *Rev.* iv. 4. he is not content to ſay, in oppoſition to Dr. *Hammond*, That *there is not any reſpect there to Biſhops or their Ornaments at this day uſed by them*; but he adds, *They had the Thing then without the Ornaments, and now we have the Ornaments without the Thing*: that is, they had ſomething like Biſhops, in thoſe days, without the Veſtments and Habits; but now, in our days, we have thoſe Formalities, but void of the *Thing*, *i. e.* True Epiſcopacy, and True Biſhops. He doth not ſpeak this of the Church of *Rome*; for *now we*, is in contradiſtinction to what is in the *Popiſh* Dominions, and therefore here is a Reflection (and a ſhrewd one) on the *Proteſtant Biſhops*, whereſoever they are. Yet this Reflecter hath the confidence to curry favour with ſome of that *Order*, and hath lately Dedicated a Book to one of our Prelates. He hath ſo highly deſerv'd of our Church, by what he hath put into his *Supplement*, concerning *Diſcipline* and *Biſhops*, that we may expect ſuddenly he will croſs the Pond, and court ſome *Engliſh* Preferment.

Philip. chap. ii. ver. 6. *Who being in the form of God*, &c. Dr. *Hammond*, he ſaith, *ought not to have interpreted* ἐν μορφῇ Θεῦ ὑπάρχων, *as if it were* Θεὸς ὤν, for the reaſon, I ſup-

poſe, before ſuggeſted, *viz.* becauſe our *Supplementer* was here (as in other places of his Writings) to gratifie a certain Party. But how then muſt we underſtand this Phraſe? Thus, he ſaith, ὃς μορφῇ Θεῷ *is beſt of all interpreted by* Grotius, *of that Power which was obſervable in Chriſt, in ſo great a degree, that he could do whatever he pleaſed, wherein he came as near as poſſible to the moſt High God.* Though Chriſt was not the *moſt High God*, yet *he came as near as poſſible to him.* This is juſt as good ſence as *wonderful almoſt.* When Chriſt is ſaid, by the Apoſtle, to have been *in the form of God*, it is all one as if he had ſaid, he was *almoſt God.* this is the excellent Theology of our *Gallobelgick* Critick. In the ſame place, he tells us, that *he underſtands the* μορφὴ Θεῦ, *as he doth* (afterwards) μορφὴ δούλου, *the form of a ſervant*, ver. 7. where we find him thus interpreting that place; *Chriſt did not really become a Servant, but ſeemed to be ſuch.* Wherefore, according to his own Expoſition, Chriſt was not really *God*, but only *ſeemed* to be ſuch: which is ſomething below his *almoſt.* Yet we muſt not ſay, no, nor ſo much as think that this Writer is a Friend of the *Unitarians* of this Age. This is very hard, you will ſay, but it muſt be ſo.

And ſo as to his Interpretation of thoſe words, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, which he expreſſes thus.

thus, *He did not think it a thing which he might ſnatch or raviſh to himſelf*, viz. to be *equal with God*, any one ſees *whoſe* Cauſe he patronizes, though he pretends to apply this to the *Humanity* of Chriſt. To this purpoſe, he violently preſſes the word ἁρπαγμὸς into his ſervice; for (as One hath obſerved of him) he makes his Criticiſm all along a Lacquey to his Opinion, and ſtrains his Art, to ſupport a Cauſe which he hath unhappily eſpouſed. And I cannot but give my Suffrage to what that Perſon further ſaith, That if this Author goes on after the rate that he hath begun, he will criticize a great part of our Religion out of doors. He makes ἁρπαγμὸς, which is *direptio, rapina, furtum*, to be ſynonymous with ἁρπακτὸς *raptus, ereptus, furto ablatus*: and ſo confounds the act of *ſtealing* or *robbing*, with the thing that is *ſtollen* or *robb'd*; which is ſuch an errant depraving of Things and Words, that none but a Hackney-Critick would have been guilty of it. For truly, I am of opinion, that there are *Writers*, as well as *Soldiers*, *of Fortune*: There are true *Switzers* of the Pen, that always take to that ſide which pays beſt. And therefore when it is intimated by ſome body, that other Writers are *hired*, and that *Rewards* and *Gifts* move their Pens, we muſt take this to be ſaid only for a Blind. None but a Mercenary Scribe, none but a Man that hath abandon'd his former

Principles through the proſpect of Gain, would thus debauch his Criticks and his Conſcience at once, as we know ſome have done.

Coloſ. chap. i. ver. 15. *Who is the image of the inviſible God.* Or, as our *Supplementer* gives it us, *the viſible image of the inviſible God.* But this is his own Interpolation, and foiſted in, to ſerve his own turn. And God the Father is here call'd the *Inviſible God*, not becauſe his Son (who is here call'd his *Image*) is not inviſible, *viz.* as to his Divine Nature, but becauſe the Father, not aſſuming the humane and viſible Nature, is on that account *Inviſible.* And the *Son* is fitly ſaid to be the *Image* of God the Father, as a *Son* is the Image of his *Father*; and therefore this Text hath been looked upon by Chriſtians, in all Ages, as a clear Teſtimony of the Divinity of our Saviour. And ſo Dr. *Hammond* reckoned it to be; and for that reaſon *Monſieur* is diſpleas'd, and runs quite counter to him, interpreting εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, as he did μορφὴ θεοῦ, *viz.* concerning the Humane Nature of Chriſt.

Hebr. chap. i. ver. 3. *Who being the brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon.* Which he applies alſo (as we know who do) to the Manhood of our Saviour, and excludes his Divinity. But how doth he *prove* that the words are to be underſtood thus? That is a thing which he is not much concern'd for;

ſor; but however, he will be ſaying ſomething. *It muſt be*, ſaith he, *the Humane Nature which this ſacred Writer ſpeaks of, that the Jews might underſtand what he ſaid was true; for that alone is viſible, and nothing but what is ſuch can be call'd* the image *or* brightneſs *of any thing among men.* This is the weighty Reaſon he gives, why this paſſage muſt be underſtood of Chriſt as Man: But this ſhews him to be as ill a Diſputant, as what he offer'd ſometime before proved him to be a ſhallow Critick. For it was no ways neceſſary, in order to the *Jews underſtanding* what the Apoſtle ſaith here, that he ſhould ſpeak of ſomething *viſible*, viz. to the corporal eye. There may be a *Brightneſs* and an *Image* which are not bodily and material; and ſuch is the Eternal Son of God, the Second Perſon in the Trinity, who is the *Brightneſs*, the Splendour, the glorious Reflexion of his Father's Glory, and therefore by the Ancient Chriſtians ſtiled *Light of Light*. And being the *Son* of God by Eternal Generation, he is the *expreſs Image*, *Character* or *Repreſentation* of his *Father*. This the *Jews* might *underſtand*, and underſtand it to be *true*, tho' the Apoſtle did not ſpeak of any thing that was *viſible* to the outward eye. Otherwiſe we muſt ſay that the *Jews* (for to them St. *John* wrote his Firſt Epiſtle) did not, and could not underſtand the Apoſtle, when he told them, that *God is Light*,

Light, 1 Joh. i. 1. and conſequently *bright* and *viſible*, but not in a ſenſible and corporeal way. Hence it appears, that what *Monſieur* alledges, is very vain and impertinent, and purpoſely forc'd to ſerve an Hypotheſis. It is not my buſineſs now to prove the *Divinity* of our Saviour, from this place, becauſe it hath been perform'd by ſeveral excellent Writers: but only I propoſed this, to let the World ſee what the *Supplementer* aims at in his *Annotations*, to wit, to oppoſe Dr. *Hammond* right or wrong, and chiefly to ingratiate himſelf with thoſe Men that deride the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. And yet he can't endure to hear of this.

In his Notes on St. *James*'s *Epiſtle*, he ſhews his diſlike of the *Sacred Order* or *Function* in ſeveral places; which I may have occaſion more particularly and diſtinctly to conſider another time. At preſent it ſhall ſuffice to take notice of only one Paſſage, wherein he expreſſes a great undervaluing of the *Miniſters* and *Elders of the Church*. Thoſe, ſaith he, *do not uſe to give better or more faithful Advice*, in the diſcharge of their Office and Miniſtry, *than any other Pious and Learned Men; when Experience teaches us that they have no more Diſcretion than others, and often uſe Religion only as a means to enrich themſelves, or increaſe their Authority*. So he on *Jam.* v. 16. which diſcovers his great ſpite againſt that Diſtinct Office of Men which Chriſt hath

hath appointed in his Church, for this belongs not to *Paraphraſe*, or *Commentary*, or *Critical* and *Philological Remarks*, which he deſign'd to be the Contents of his Book (if you will believe him) and therefore we may conclude it was brought in merely to ſhew his ill will to the Clergy. And in other places on this Epiſtle, and on the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, he is very ſevere on this Rank of Men: He often ſnaps them under the title of *Divines*, the *late Divines*, the *Modern Divines*; he repreſents them as whimſical and trifling People, they will invent and ſay any thing: *What will not Divines find in the Scripture?* p. 332. And *Theological Conjecture*, p. 370. is with him another Expreſſion for *what hath no manifeſt Ground in Scripture.* In ſhort, it is one of his *Common Places* to bruſh the Clergy, to ſhew himſelf ſurly to them, and to attend to nothing in their favour. Therefore Dr. *Hammond* could not expect to find fairer quarter than he doth.

St. *John*, 1 Epiſt. chap. v. verſ. 7. *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father*, &c. Which whole Verſe he labours to prove to be Spurious and Suppoſititious, as all the *Unitarians* expected of him: and he hath not fail'd their Expectations; for they will like any thing from ſo hopeful a Convert that is ſaid in their defence. But as for any true and ſolid Proof of this Verſe's being counterfeited, there is no

ſuch thing, but only a bare repeating of what hath been alledged often by that Party, and hath been fully and ſubſtantially anſwer'd by very Learned and Judicious Writers on the other ſide, and by ſome of our own Church, as Biſhop *Pearſon* and Biſhop *Stillingfleet*: whom he would have attack'd moſt certainly, if he thought he could have done any thing to the purpoſe. But in ſtead of this, he expoſes the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as diſagreeable to *Scripture*, to the *Fathers* and *Antiquity* (for he particularly mentions theſe) and to be found only in ſome dull Theological Syſtems.

But then not granting, but only ſuppoſing this Verſe not to be Spurious, he contends that thoſe words, *Theſe three are one*, are to be underſtood of *an Unity of Teſtimony, and not of an Unity of Nature*; which is the very Language of *Socinus* and his Followers. And whereas *theſe three are one*, is a different way of expreſſion from what follows in the next Verſe, *theſe three agree in one*; and therefore plainly argues the Difference of Senſe, he is ſo flat and dull as to ſay, *It is otherwiſe expreſs'd in this following Verſe for Variety ſake*; and adds, *or alſo by mere accident*. Here ſurely we may ſay as he doth ſometimes of Dr. *Hammond*, *He was ſcarce awake when he wrote this*: for would any ſenſible Man tell the World, that the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture, when he ſpeaks differently concerning

cerning things of a different nature, doth only *vary the Phraſe*? Or would any Man awake, and in his wits, declare that the Holy Spirit, in theſe Writings, expreſſes himſelf thus and thus *by mere accident*? Yet this is the Language and Sentiment of our Author, and he is forcibly put upon them to ſhift off this Text, which is ſo illuſtrious a Proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity. *Theſe three, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, are one*, ſaith the Inſpired Apoſtle, that is, they are one in Eſſence, they are the ſame as to Unity of Subſtance; thus, though they are Perſonally three, they are but One. For if you take the words otherwiſe, the ſenſe is poor and lank; if you underſtand it of *Unity of Conſent*, (as *Mounſieur le Clerc* and his Friends do) the ſame may be ſaid of the Angels and bleſſed Spirits in Heaven; they, though they are many, are all but *one* in Conſent and Harmony, as well as *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt*: and therefore hence it follows, if we will let St. *John* ſpeak ſenſe, that *the three that bear record in heaven* mention'd here, muſt be ſaid to be *one* in another and higher ſenſe than the Angels and Saints in Heaven can be ſaid to be ſo. Any unprejudiced Perſon will agree to this, I doubt not. And as for what he talks of *Copies*, with reference to what was ſaid before, it is moſt certain and unqueſtionable that the *Ancienteſt* and *moſt Approved* ones

ones have this Verse entire; and some of the Ancientest and Learnedest Fathers make mention of it, as *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, *Athanasius*, *Jerom*, besides *Victor Uticensis* and *Fulgentius*, &c. Wherefore, I conclude, that strong Prejudice and Prepossession govern this Author in whatever he Writes.

Some

Some brief

ANIMADVERSIONS

On the latter Part of

Monſieur le Clerc's LETTER

prefix'd by him to his

SUPPLEMENT.

I Have ſeen and read a little Piece, Intituled, *A Modeſt but Free Cenſure on ſome late Controverſial Writings*, &c. where, towards the end of it, the Author paſſes his Cenſure on ſome things in *Monſieur le Clerc's Ars Critica*. Whereupon the *Monſieur*, being ſomewhat nettled, drew up an Anſwer, or rather pretends it to be ſuch, to what the *Modeſt Cenſurer* had objected againſt him. I have ſeen and read this likewiſe, and becauſe it hath ſome cognation with what I have diſcours'd upon out of *Monſieur's Supplement*, I will briefly lay the whole matter on both ſides before the Reader, with ſome brief Reflections on either. Firſt, The

Mon-

Monſieur was juſtly blamed by the *Cenſurer* for diſparaging the *Sacrifice* of Chriſt, and repreſenting it as *Improper and Metaphorical*; but in his *Letter* he rather aggravates his fault than diminiſhes it, and ſpeaks contemptibly of that *Sacrifice*, and tells us, that when it is ſo often ſaid that Chriſt was a *Sacrifice for our Sins*, it is only *a Phraſe taken from the Cuſtom of the Jews*; but that we can't gather thence that Chriſt was a *Victim* or *True Sacrifice*. It might have been expected that the *Modeſt Cenſurer* ſhould have given him occaſion to clear himſelf of the Imputation which was inſinuated, and that he ſhould expreſly own Chriſt's Death to be a *Proper Sacrifice*: but it is obſervable that he is ſo ſtiff that he will not ſay Chriſt's Death was a Sacrifice, but *it might have the efficacy of a Sacrifice*. He doth not ſay, *it hath*. And yet ſee at the ſame time the weakneſs of the Man! though he will not affirm here, that Chriſt's Death is a Sacrifice; yet he grants it *might* have the ſame Efficacy and Vertue that a Sacrifice hath, which is a very groundleſs and irrational Notion, and confounds the Nature of things; yea, makes them to be and not to be. Our Saviour may be, and may not be a Sacrifice: or, though Chriſt's Death was not a Proper Sacrifice, yet *it might have the Efficacy* of one. Such Logick is fit only to be laugh'd at.

In

In the next place, he cenſures the *Cenſurer* as *negligent* in his tranſlating of [*ejus pietatis*,] (as he finds fault with Dr. *Hammond*, for *not well tranſlating* ſeveral paſſages in Authors that he quotes) but it now appears that the Cenſurer was not negligent, but too favourable to our Critick, who makes it evident, by his own Engliſhing of thoſe words, that he looks upon the Sacrifice of Chriſt, ſuch as it was, to be part of his *Worſhip* or *Duty* to God, as the *Jews Sacrifices* were. As *they* were *pious* in that Service, ſo *Chriſt* ſhew'd his *piety* in offering himſelf on the Croſs, though he was not *properly* a Sacrifice. All this is no other than the *Unitarian* ſtrain, as every one knows that hath read their Writings.

He doth not take off the ſtrength of the next Objection, about the Name *God*; for he had, in his *Ars Critica*, endeavoured to prove that this *Name* ſignifies oftentimes ſome *Great and Venerable Being*, though not the True God: And thereby he made way for the *Socinian* Notion, That Chriſt's being called *God*, in Scripture, is no argument of his being the True God. He doth not ſo much as attempt to remove this, which yet he ſhould have been obliged to do, if he had taken any care, or had any mind to anſwer the Objection: Which, I ſuppoſe, he was conſcious of his inability to do, and therefore laſhes out into impertinent

beſeeching and *aſſuring*, &c. becauſe he had nothing elſe to ſay.

To take off the next Scruple, he referrs us to his *Commentary* on *Gen.* iii. 19. But if the Reader will be at the pains to conſult it, he will find, that that is but an Evaſion, and that there is ſtill ground for what was Objected.

As to the import of *God's writing his laws in mens hearts*, he will not own it to be any ſuch thing as *the Spirit's enlightning the underſtandings of the Faithful, and effectually working upon their wills*, though he can't deny it to be a peculiar Promiſe belonging to the *New Covenant*. Nay, he tells us plainly what Party he ſides with, when he declares, that that Spiritual Enlightning and Effectual Working *cannot be demonſtrated by any Theological Arguments*. Thus we ſee he confeſſes that which he pretended to diſguiſe: ſo that whether his Weakneſs or his Perverſeneſs are moſt to be cenſured, it is not eaſie to determine.

He is very ſhallow in his next attempt, *viz.* on *Act.* xvi. 14. *The Lord opened the heart of Lydia*, &c. which he had ſaid before *had nothing of Emphaſis in it*, but expreſſes only a general and common work of *Providence*, in the way of *Machines*, which have only a material and external operation. But now to bring himſelf off with his *Machines*, he lets us know, that it is a *metaphorical Phraſe, taken from*

from Cities that are batter'd with Engines. Say you ſo, Good Sir? then *Lydia* was not wrought upon by mere Moral Swaſion, and Gentle Convictions of Conſcience; but this *opening of her heart*, was a forcible and violent work. Here was *Battering* and *Storming*, and conſequently it is manifeſt, that you ruine your ſelf with your own *Machines*: You interpret the words contrary to your own mind and opinion, merely to ſalve the Objection which was rais'd againſt you. You compare the opening of *Lydia*'s heart, to that Irreſiſtible Shock which is made by Battering Engines upon Beſieged Cities; and yet, I'm ſure, you don't believe any *Irreſiſtible Efficacy of the Spirit*, for you ſay there is no ſuch thing, *p.* 16. And *ſuch an Inſpiration whereby God irreſiſtibly works on ſome, is no where intimated in Scripture*, p. 17. I diſpute not now, whether there may not be ſuch a work upon *ſome*, in an *extraordinary* way, (as the moſt Learned Divines of our own Church have granted) but I only obſerve at preſent, that *Monſieur Le Clerc* hath a talent of contradicting himſelf. He was hard put to it, when to ſolve what he had vainly and groundleſly aſſerted, he vents a Notion which he and his Fraternity abhorr at their very hearts, if their Mouths and Pens be any Teſtimony of what is there. So then, this Gentleman may give *Tully* his Quotation out of him, about *Machines*,

back again, for this poor Engineer can make no uſe of them. All that can be ſaid under this head, is this, That theſe are the Tricks of a Man whoſe own Conſcience condemns him, and who unawares utters that Truth which he oppoſes. He manages the matter ſo, that it is eaſie to ſee he is as unfit a Man to put an end to a Controverſie, as he is good at Detracting and Calumniating not only the Learned *Hammond*, but the *Modeſt Cenſurer*.

Whereas there was offence taken, and that juſtly, at his repreſenting the words *Redemption*, and to *Redeem*, as *ambiguous* and *doubtful* in Scripture, and hard to be underſtood when they are applied to our Saviour's Redemption, he cannot (though his Invention be very fertile) find any Return to make to it: As much as to tell us that he was really guilty of a falſe repreſentation of thoſe words, and hath not always the confidence to excuſe or defend his Falſhoods.

So the Reader may obſerve how ſilent he is, when the *Cenſurer* tells him that he undertakes, in his *Ars Critica*, to reckon up all the ſignifications of the word *Spirit* in the Old and New Teſtament, and yet can't find ſo much as one place where it ſignifies the *Third Perſon in the Trinity*. Had not this Allegation been real, and exactly adjuſted to Truth, we ſhould have had him hammering at leaſt (as in other places)

at

at ſome Evaſion, becauſe this was one of the principal things he was concern'd in. Whence, without any ſtraining, an impartial Reader may conclude, that it is the judicious Sentiment of this learned Critick, that neither in the Old or New Teſtament the word *Spirit* is meant concerning a Diſtinct Perſon in the Godhead, and conſequently that he denies that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures. Nay, it ſeems he is deſirous that this ſhould be known to be his Opinion, for otherwiſe he would have adventured to ſay ſomething in anſwer to what was alledg'd ſo fairly and evidently againſt him. This, I think, any rational Man will inferr; and yet (that we may ſee what a Riddle the *Monſieur* is) he is every where bewailing his ſad lot, that he is branded for a *Socinian*; and he recoils with mighty indignation, when he is charged with a Deſign of propagating *Socinianiſm* by *Art Critick*. *He knows* (he ſaith) *his own mind and purpoſe a great deal better, and he utterly denies it; and there is nothing in the thing it ſelf which argues that he did ſo deſignedly*, p. 13. Yes, Sir, the thing that is before us plainly argues as much; for you hook in the word *Spirit* into the *5th. Chapter* of your *Critical Art*, merely to enervate the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*; for you labour to prove that the Scriptures no where mention the word *Spirit* as a Diſtinct

Perſon in the Divinity: And if we can't meet with the word in that ſence in the Bible, be ſure there is no ſuch thing as a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead. Whence it follows, that it was your deſign to *propagate Socinianiſm*, which was the thing laid to your charge. And when the *Modeſt Cenſurer* told the World of this, he is prophanely call'd by you *the Searcher of hearts*. The ſhort is, you and ſome others deſerve that Name and Title which is given you, but you are aſhamed to call your ſelves by it; ſo ſcandalous a thing is *Socinianiſm*, as one rightly ſaith.

What he adds in the next Section, by way of *Inference*, is inconſiſtent with common ſence, and betrays great inadvertency and alienation of Thoughts, wherefore I diſmiſs it; only taking notice that he is offended, he ſaith, at the *Cenſurers* comparing his good Friends the *Socinians* to *Heathens*, and yet theſe *latter* are not ſo much as mention'd. This ſhews that he will thruſt any thing upon the Reader, and beſides, that he is conſcious of ſome ſymbolizing between *Socinianiſm* and *Paganiſm*.

In his next Enterprize he is very fierce and angry, as if the very naming of St. *Auguſtine* were enough to enrage a Pupil of *Socinus*, eſpecially a *Critical* and *Philological* one. In great fury he lets fly on that holy Father, in ſuch vile language as this; *St.* Auguſtine *neither thought*

thought piouſly, nor wrote learnedly of God, in the matter of *Grace: And as little piety and learning doth he ſhew in his Epiſtles to* Boniface *and* Vincentius. And again, *He was one of the very firſt that promoted ſome two Doctrines which take away all Goodneſs and Juſtice both from God and Men.* And one of theſe *ſome two Doctrines,* you muſt note, was that of *Original Sin,* and the Corruption derived from *Adam* to all Mankind. A Man can't be *pious* and *learned,* it ſeems, if he hold this. Well, but ſtill he falls upon St. *Auguſtine,* and tells us that it was this impious and unlearned Father that ſtirr'd up the *French King* to Dragoon the Proteſtants, and *to force many thouſands of them* (whereof this Author was one) *who lived in his Kingdom, to fly their Country.* What a Wretch was this *Auſtin?* (for now we muſt no longer call him *Saint*) Can't he be content to be the author of much miſchief when he was alive, but muſt he do more when he is dead? —— Conſult the *Monſieur,* and you'll find that he heartily rails at the good Father, becauſe he favour'd the ſuppreſſing of *Hereticks*: and it's likely he fared the worſe for his *Books of the Trinity.* We will not, for the future, think it ſtrange that *Monſieur* reviles and defames our Excellent Dr. *Hammond,* a Perſon of great Eminency in the Church for Learning and Piety, ſeeing we find him inveighing againſt the famous Biſhop of *Hippo,*

one of the moſt Glorious Lights of the Chriſtian Church in ancient Times.

He anſwers nothing to what was alledged againſt him out of his *9th. Chapter*; but being lately chafed and put out of order by St. *Auguſtine*, he reaks his malice upon the *Cenſurer*, and from his free way of dealing with him, he inferrs, that *he hath not only exterminated Charity, but even Juſtice and Truth out of the number of Chriſtian Vertues.* But then where is *Monſieur*'s Charity, Civility and Modeſty, when in that Chapter he proclaims to the World, That *Divines, no leſs than others, love to talk concerning thoſe things which they have no underſtanding of.* How Civil and Charitable is he, when again he bellows out, *They talk Nonſence, and know not what they ſay.* And would you know what is ſome of the *Nonſence* of theſe *Divines?* he tells you they prattle about *an Incomprehenſible thing*, and about *Nothing*, i. e. (as he means it) the *Trinity*, and ſuch like Doctrines of Chriſtianity, which are laugh'd at by his Friends, under the Title of *Incomprehenſible* and *Myſterious Nothings.* Judge now whether this Man's Brains be not byaſs'd againſt the *Eccleſiaſticks*; and whether he hath not a gift of finding out Nonſence where it is not, and not diſcerning it where it is, namely, in his own Writings.

Next,

Next, I might obſerve how he wilfully diſguiſes the matter which before (in his 14*th. Chapter*) he had plainly propoſed, *viz.* that the word Λόγος was uſed by St. *John*, in the beginning of his Goſpel, *in a Platonick way*; and yet now he comes and diſtinguiſhes between a *Platonick Way* and a *Platonick Sence*, and would make us believe that he only *intimated* that the word Λόγος might be capable of a different notion. Which is too manifeſt a proof of the Sophiſtry of our over-grown Critick. And as for his bold aſſerting, That *all Chriſtians at this day differ from the Determination of the Council of* Nice, no Man in his wits would have again vouched ſuch an apparent falſity, ſince from the late moſt learned Biſhop of *Worceſter* we have ſo irrefragable a Demonſtration of the contrary, in his *Vindication of the Trinity.* He will ſatisfie him about *Gregory Nazianzen*, and what he ſaith of Dr. *Cudworth.*

Our Author, in his Remarks on what the *Modeſt Cenſurer* had obſerved concerning his 16*th. Chapter*, is very mild. Having been freely check'd by him, for his unworthy dealing with the Ancient Chriſtians, and his upbraiding them for their *Myſtical* Diſcourſes, and for his joining with *Porphyrius* (the implacable Adverſary of Chriſtianity) in this very thing, he is ſo tame as not to make any Reply, and he is

of

of a ſudden grown ſo baſhful as not to attempt any thing.

But this is but a ſhort fit, and he ſuddenly runs into another Extreme: For he concludes as he began, and as he went on, with odious Inſinuations, uncharitable Surmiſes, and ſome down-right Falſities. Wherefore I adviſe him to call himſelf to an Account for theſe and all the other ill things both here and in his *Supplement*, and in the reſt of his Writings: And let him not think that Heaven will be favourable unto him, unleſs he repent of them. Which I ſpeak and wiſh with a hearty Good-will to him, praying unto God not to lay theſe things to his charge, but rather to reduce him to a ſound and honeſt Mind, which hitherto little appears in him and his Writings.

F I N I S.

AN INDEX OF

Memorable Things contained in *Monſieur Le* CLERC's *Supplement* and *Letter*, and Reflected upon in the foregoing Diſcourſe.

A

ADoption *is not in this Life. On* Rom. viii. 23. pag. 46

Apoſtolical *way of Writing*, viz. *to allude to Stories in the Old Teſtament, and to apply them to the preſent Subject, only becauſe it was thought a piece of Elegance to borrow things out of thoſe Old Writings. On* 1 Cor. x. 3. p. 55

Averſeneſs *of the Monſieur to the* Church *and* Church-Diſcipline. *On* Mat. xviii. 17. p. 34

Auguſtin (*St.*) *was neither Pious nor Learned. He promoted ſuch Doctrines as take away all goodneſs from God and Men. He ſtirr'd up the preſent* French King *to perſecute and expell the Proteſtants.* Animadver. *on his* Letter *before his* Supplement. p. 80

INDEX.

B

Biſhops *and Presbyters are not ſafely to be heard in their own Cauſe. On* Phil. i. 1. p. 62

Biſhops *heretofore were without Ornaments, but now we have Ornaments without true Epiſcopacy,* ibid. & p. 63

C

CHriſt *is ſaid, by the Writers of the New Teſtament, to be a* Sacrifice; *which is only a Phraſe or way of ſpeaking taken from the Cuſtom of the Jews.* Animadver. *on his* Letter. p. 74

Chriſt *came as near as poſſible to the moſt High God. On* Phil. ii. 6. p. 63

Church-Cenſures *ſcare him very much, and why. On* 2 Cor. vii. 8. p. 60

Clergy *laſh'd by him. On St.* James's *Epiſtle; and on Epiſt. to* Timothy *and* Titus.

Covenants *in Scripture are improperly ſo called, and the Doctrine of them diſparaged. On Dr.* Hammond's Annotat. *on the* Title of the Book. p. 14

Criticiſm *is made a Lacquey to his Opinion. On* Phil. ii. 6. p. 63

Cymbal, *a proper Epithet for ſo Noiſie a Grammarian, On* Mat. xvi. 18. p. 31

D

DIſputant *and Critick alike. On* Heb. i. 3. p. 66

Divines *are ſubtile Inventers, but no ſolid Provers. On Dr.* Ham. *Annotat. on the* Title of the Book. p. 14

Divines, *no leſs than others, love to talk Nonſence, and what they know not.* Animad. *on his* Letter. p. 82

Duty *to Magiſtrates is not included in the* Fifth Commandment. *On* Rom. xiii. 9. p. 48

Epiſtles

E

EPistles *of the Apostles may be torn or burnt, or any other ways disposed of, and yet we shall be never the less Disciples of Christ. On* 1 Cor. v. 9. p. 53
Evangelists *and Apostles, in their Writings, speak what they know not. On Dr.* Hammond's Annotat. *on the* Title of the Book. p. 14
Excommunication, *no less than Magistrates, dislik'd by him. On* 1 Cor. iii. 2. p. 52

F

FUgitive *from his Word and Profession,* p. 2

G

GEnealogy *of Christ set down by St.* Matthew, *is defective and false. On* Matth. i. p. 17
Grieving *the Holy Spirit of God, is grieving the Gifts of the Spirit. On* Eph. iv. 30. p. 61

H

HEathen *Criticism. On* Mat. xi. 28. p. 25
History *of our Saviour's Temptation was but a Dream. On* Matth. iv. 1. p. 22

I

INfinitive Mood *mistaken by him for the Indicative. On* Joh. xvii. 3. p. 42
Inspired *Writers disparaged. On* Matth. i. p. 17. *On* Matth. ii. 15. p. 19
Irresistible *working of the Spirit asserted by him, though against his Persuasion.* Animadvers. *on his* Letter. p. 76

L

Λόγος, *according to him, is a Quality, not a Person. On* Joh. i. 1. p. 40

M

Manna *is call'd Spiritual, because it was made by Spirits. On* 1 Cor. x. 3. p. 55
Memory *fails him. On* Rom. viii. 23. p. 46
Modesty *wanting.* Animad. *on* Letter. Every where.

N

New *Notions started by him, but soon forgot and laid aside. On* Mat. xxviii. 19. p. 38
Nonsence. *On* Rom. xiii. 9. p. 48

P

Prejudice *and Prepossession govern this Author.* Every where.
Prisian's *Head broke, and no Plaister administred. On* Joh. xvii. 3. p. 42
Prophecies *in the Old Testament ought not so and so to be interpreted, because the Apostles, who were Inspired by the Holy Ghost, did in that manner interpret them, On* Matth. ii. 15. p. 19

Q

Quaker-*like, he is Ambiguous and Fluttering. On* Joh. i. 1, *&c.* p. 40

R

Redemption *wrought by Christ, represented as Ambiguous and Doubtful.* Animadv. *on* Letter. p. 78

Scrip-

S

SCripture-Expreſſions *are by mere accident. On* 1 Joh. v. 7. p. 69
Sin *is not pardoned by God in this life. On* Mat. xviii. 35. p. 35
Single *Circumſtances of Sin are not taken notice of by God. On* Mat. xviii. 35. ibid.
Spirit *is a word often uſed in the Old and New Teſtament, but there is not one place to be found where it ſignifies a diſtinct Perſon in the Godhead.* Animad. *on his* Letter. p. 78, 79, 80

T

TExts *interpreted by him according to the mind of the* Unitarians. Every where.
Theologiſt *and Critick alike. On* Mat. xviii. 35. p. 35
Tranſlator *and Grammarian alike. On* Joh. xvii. 3. p. 42
Trinity *expoſed.* Every where.
Types, *or Typical Prefigurations, not to be found any where in the Old Teſtament. On* 1 Cor. x. 3. p. 55

V

VErtue *is not profitable. On* Mat. xi. 30. p. 28
Uncouth *and wild Jargon the Monſieur is guilty of. On* Eph. iv. 30. p. 61
Ungrammatical *Interpretation. On* Mat. xvi. 18. p. 31

W

WOrſhiping *of God is only tacitly contain'd in the* Firſt Commandment, *and concerns not all Mankind. On* Rom. xiii. 9. p. 48
Wreſting *of the Devil's words. On* Luk. iv. 9. p. 40

THE END.

Some Books Printed for *L. Meredith*, at the *Star*, in St. *Paul's Church-yard.*

THE Chriſtian's Sacrifice: A Treatiſe, ſhewing the Neceſſity, End, and Manner of Receiving the Holy Communion; together with ſuitable Prayers and Meditations for every Month in the Year; and the principal Feſtivals in Memory of our Bleſſed Saviour. In Four Parts. The Fourth Edittion, corrected.

The Devout Chriſtian inſtructed how to Pray and give Thanks to God: Or, A Book of Devotions for Families, and particular Perſons, in moſt of the concerns of Humane Life. The Eighth Edition. In *Twelves.*

Advice to a Friend. The Fourth Edition. In *Twelves.*

The Glorious *Epiphany*, with the Devout Chriſtians Love to it. In *Octavo.*

The Books of *Job*, *Pſalms*, *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, &c. Paraphras'd; with Arguments to each Chapter and Pſalm. In IV. Vol. *Octavo.*

The Truth of Chriſtian Religion. In Six Books. Written in *Latine* by *Hugo Grotius*, and now tranſlated into *Engliſh*, with the Addition of a Seventh Book againſt the preſent *Roman* Church. In *Octavo.*

The Rules and Exerciſes of Holy Living and Holy Dying. In *Octavo.*

The Golden Grove: A choice Manual, containing what is to be Believed, Practiſed, and Deſired or Prayed for; the Prayers being fitted to the ſeveral Days of the Week: Alſo Feſtival Hymns according to the manner of the Ancient Church.

½ calf